

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX** **1888**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

January, 1888

Foreword
Chronological Survey

1888
“To the Readers of Lucifer”
“A Modern Magician”—Review
“Absolute Monism”—Review
The Church and the Doctrine of Atonement
A Note of Explanation
Miscellaneous Notes

February, 1888

Chinese Shadows
“What is Truth?”
Footnotes to “The Soldier’s Daughter”
“Traité élémentaire de science occulte”—Review
What of Phenomena?
Correspondence
Miscellaneous Notes

March, 1888

Sunday Devotion to Pleasure
The Life Principle
From “Lucifer” to a Few Readers
Re the Brain Theorem of the Universe
The Late Mrs. Anna Kingsford, M. D.
From the Note Book of an Unpopular Philosopher
Miscellaneous Notes

April, 1888

Conversations on Occultism
What Good has Theosophy done in India?
Footnotes to “Buddhist Doctrine of the Western Heaven”
Footnotes and Comments on “Ultimate Philosophy”

Christian Lecturers on Buddhism, and Plain Facts about the same, by Buddhists
Practical Occultism
Correspondence
“Woman: her Glory, her Shame, and her God”—Review
“Visions”—Review
[Controversy between H. P. Blavatsky and the Abbé Roca]
 Reply to Madame Blavatsky’s Observations on
 Christian Esotericism (*Abbé Roca*)—February, 1888
 Réponse aux Fausses Conceptions de M. l’Abbé Roca
 Relatives à mes Observations sur l’Ésotérisme Chrétien (*H.P.B.*)
 Reply to the Mistaken Conceptions of the Abbé Roca concerning my
 Observations on Christian Esotericism (*translation of the above*)
Footnotes to “The Tide of Life”
Letter from H. P. Blavatsky to the Second American Convention

May, 1888

Occultism versus the Occult Arts
Footnotes to “The Śraddha”
The Crucifixion of Man
Is this an Error? (August, 1888)
A Puzzle in “Esoteric Buddhism”
Practical Occultism
Why do Animals Suffer?
Is there no Hope?
Who are the Eurasians?
Miscellaneous Notes

June, 1888

Theosophy or Jesuitism?
[Compiler’s Notes]
Karmic Visions
[Unsupported Claims of the Roman Catholic Church]
Miscellaneous Notes
[Controversy between H. P. Blavatsky and the Abbé Roca]
 Réponse de l’Abbé Roca aux Allégations de Madame Blavatsky
 contre l’Ésotérisme Chrétien (*Abbé Roca*)—with Footnotes
 by H. P. B.
 Reply of Abbé Roca to Madame Blavatsky’s Allegations against
 Christian Esotericism (*Abbé Roca*)—with Footnotes
 by H. P. B. (*translation of the above*)
Letter to the Editor of “The Path”
[Additional Material: Conversations on Occultism (continued)]

APPENDIX:

Note on the Transliteration of Sanskrit

ILLUSTRATIONS:

H.P. B.’s Residence 17, Lansdowne Road, London

William Quan Judge
Dr. Anna Bonus Kingsford
H.P.Blavatsky
Annie Besant
Charles Johnston
Thoth and Horus Purifying the King
Alfred Percy Sinnett
Dr. Archibald Keightley and Dr. Herbert A. W. Coryn
Bertram Keightley
Julia Wharton Keightley
Don Jose Xifré

Facsimiles

The Gem

No More

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**

FOREWORD TO VOLUME NINE

The material in the present Volume is in direct chronological sequence to the writings published in Volume VIII. It contains the continuation of H.P. B.'s controversy with the Abbé Roca, and her forceful essay on Theosophy or Jesuitism, among other writings covering a vast number of subjects.

No special acknowledgements are required in connection with his Volume, as the same individuals have helped in its production as those already fully mentioned in the Foreword to Volume VII.

We are deeply grateful for the continued interest they have shown in his endeavour, and the willing help they have given, each in his or her own way, towards the successful completion of the Manuscript.

BORIS DE ZIRKOFF,
Compiler

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, U.S.A
January 15, 1959.

***Collected Writings* VOLUME IX**
January, 1888

1888

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 5, January, 1888, pp. 337-338]

People usually wish that their friends shall have a happy new year, and sometimes “prosperous” is added to “happy.” It is not likely that much happiness or prosperity can come to those who are living for the truth under such a dark number as 1888; but still the year is heralded by the glorious star Venus-Lucifer, shining so resplendently that it has been mistaken for that still rarer visitor, the star of Bethlehem. This too, is at hand; and surely something of the Christos spirit must be born upon earth under such conditions. Even if happiness and prosperity are absent, it is possible to find something greater than either in this coming year. Venus-Lucifer is the sponsor of our magazine, and as we chose to come to light under its auspices, so do we desire to touch on its nobility. This is possible for us all personally, and instead of wishing our readers a happy or prosperous New Year, we feel more in the vein to pray them to make it one worthy of its brilliant herald. This can be effected by those who are courageous and resolute. Thoreau pointed out that there are artists in life, persons who can change the colour of a day and make it beautiful to those with whom they come in contact. We claim that there are adepts, masters in life who make it divine, as in all other arts. Is it not the greatest art of all, this which affects the very atmosphere in which we live? That it is the most important is seen at once, when we remember that every person who draws the breath of life affects the mental and moral atmosphere of the world, and helps to colour the day for those about him. Those who do not help to elevate the thoughts and lives of others must of necessity either paralyse them by indifference, or actively drag them down. When this point is reached, then the art of life is converted into the science of death; we see the black magician at work. And no one can be quite

inactive. Although many bad books and pictures are produced, still not everyone who is incapable of writing or painting well insists on doing so badly. Imagine the result if they were to! Yet so it is in life. Everyone lives, and thinks, and speaks. If all our readers who have any sympathy with *Lucifer* endeavoured to learn the art of making life not only beautiful but divine, and vowed no longer to be hampered by disbelief in the possibility of this miracle, but to commence the Herculean task at once, then 1888, however unlucky a year, would have been fitly ushered in by the gleaming star. Neither happiness nor prosperity are always the best of bedfellows for such undeveloped mortals as most of us are; they seldom bring with them peace, which is the only permanent joy. The idea of

peace is usually connected with the close of life and a religious state of mind. That kind of peace will however generally be found to contain the element of expectation. The pleasures of this world have been surrendered, and the soul waits contentedly in expectation of the pleasures of the next. The peace of the philosophic mind is very different from this and can be attained to early in life when pleasure has scarcely been tasted, as well as when it has been fully drunk of. The American Transcendentalists discovered that life could be made a sublime thing without any assistance from circumstances or outside sources of pleasure and prosperity. Of course this had been discovered many times before, and Emerson only took up again the cry raised by Epictetus. But every man has to discover this fact freshly for himself, and when once he has realised it he knows that he would be a wretch if he did not endeavour to make the possibility a reality in his own life. The stoic became sublime because he recognized his own absolute responsibility and did not try to evade it; the Transcendentalist was even more, because he had faith in the unknown and untried possibilities which lay within himself. The occultist fully recognises the responsibility and claims his title by having both tried and acquired knowledge of his own possibilities. The Theosophist who is at all in earnest, sees his responsibility and endeavours to find knowledge, living, in the

meantime, up to the highest standard of which he is aware. To all such *Lucifer* gives greeting! Man's life is in his own hands, his fate is ordered by himself. Why then should not 1888 be a year of greater spiritual development than any we have lived through? It depends on ourselves to make it so. This is an actual fact, not a religious sentiment. In a garden of sunflowers every flower turns towards the light. Why not so with us?

And 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.

***Collected Writings* VOLUME IX**
January, 1888

“TO THE READERS OF *LUCIFER*”

[*Lucifer*, Vol. 1, No. 5, January, 1888, pp. 340-343]

Our magazine is only four numbers old, and already its young life is full of cares and trouble. This is all as it should be; *i.e.*, like every other publication, it must fail to satisfy *all* its readers, and this is only in the nature of things and the destiny of every printed organ. But what seems a little strange in a country of culture and free thought is that *Lucifer* should receive such a number of *anonymous*, spiteful, and often abusive letters. This, of course, is but a casual remark, the waste-basket in the office being the only addressee and sufferer in this case; yet it suggests strange truths with regard to human nature. *

* “VERBUM SAP.” It is not our intention to notice anonymous communications, even though they should emanate in a round-about way from Lambeth Palace. The matter “*Verbum Sap*” refers to is not one of taste; the facts must be held responsible for the offence; and, as the Scripture hath it, “Woe to that man by whom the offence cometh”! [*Matt.*, xviii, 7.]

Sincerity is true wisdom, it appears, only to the mind of the moral philosopher. It is rudeness and insult to him who regards dissimulation and deceit as culture and politeness, and holds that the shortest, easiest, and safest way to success is to let sleeping dogs and old customs alone. But, if the dogs are obstructing the highway to progress and truth, and Society will, as a rule, reject the wise words of (St.) Augustine, who recommends that “no man should prefer custom before reason and truth,” is it a sufficient cause for the philanthropist to walk out of or even deviate from, the track of truth, because the selfish egoist chooses to do so? Very true, as remarked somewhere by Sir Thomas Browne that not every man is a proper champion for the truth, nor fit to take up the gauntlet in its cause. Too many of such defenders are apt, from inconsideration and too much zeal, to charge the troops of error so rashly that they “remain themselves as trophies to the enemies of truth.” Nor ought all of us (members of the Theosophical Society) to do so personally, but rather leave it only to those among our numbers who have voluntarily and beforehand sacrificed their personalities for the cause of Truth. Thus teaches us one of the Masters of Wisdom in some fragments of advice which are published further on for the benefit of the Theosophists (see the article that follows this).* While enforcing upon such public characters in our ranks as editors, and lecturers, etc., the duty of telling fearlessly “the Truth to the face of LIE,” he yet condemns the habit of private judgment and criticism in

every individual Theosophist.

Unfortunately, these are not the ways of the public and readers. Since our journal is entirely unsectarian, since it is neither theistic nor atheistic, Pagan nor Christian, orthodox nor heterodox, therefore, its editors discover

* [Reference is here made to an important letter from one of the Teachers published under the title of "Some Words on Daily Life." *Vide* pp. 173-75 of Volume VII in the present Series for the text of this letter.—*Compiler.*]

"TO THE READERS OF LUCIFER"

7

eternal verities in the most opposite religious systems and modes of thought. Thus *Lucifer* fails to give full satisfaction to either infidel or Christian. In the sight of the former—whether he be an Agnostic, a Secularist, or an Idealist—to find divine or occult lore underlying "the rubbish" in the Jewish Bible and Christian Gospels is sickening; in the opinion of the latter, to recognise the same truth as in the Judeo-Christian Scriptures in the Hindu, Parsi, Buddhist, or Egyptian religious literature, is vexation of spirit and blasphemy. Hence, fierce criticism from both sides, sneers and abuse. Each party would have us on its own sectarian side, recognising as truth, only that which its particular *ism* does.

But this cannot nor shall it be. Our motto was from the first, and ever shall be: "THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH." Truth we search for, and, once found, we bring it forward before the world, whenceso-ever it comes. A large majority of our readers is fully satisfied with this our policy, and that is plainly sufficient for our purposes.

It is evident that when toleration is not the outcome of indifference it must arise from wide-spreading charity and large-minded sympathy. Intolerance is pre eminently the consequence of ignorance and jealousy. He who fondly believes that he has got the great ocean in his family water-jug is naturally intolerant of his neighbour, who also is pleased to imagine that he has poured the broad expanses of the sea of truth into his own particular pitcher. But anyone who, like the Theosophists, knows how infinite is that ocean of eternal wisdom, to be fathomed by no one man, class, or party, and realizes how little the largest vessel made by man contains in comparison to what lies dormant and still unperceived in its dark, bottomless depths, cannot help but be tolerant. For he sees that others have filled their little water-jugs at the same great reservoir in which he has dipped his own, and if the water in the various pitchers seems different to the eye, it can only be because it is discoloured by impurities that were in the vessel before the pure crystalline element—a portion of the one eternal and immutable truth—entered into it.

There is, and can be, but one absolute truth in Kosmos. And little as we, with our

present limitations, can understand it in its essence, we still know that if it is absolute it must also be omnipresent and universal; and that in such case, it must be underlying every world-religion—the product of the thought and knowledge of numberless generations of thinking men. Therefore, that a portion of truth, great or small, is found in every religious and philosophical system, and that if we would find it, we have to search for it at the origin and source of every such system, at its roots and first growth, not in its later overgrowth of sects and dogmatism. Our object is not to destroy any religion but rather to help to filter each, thus ridding them of their respective impurities. In this we are opposed by all those who maintain, against evidence, that their particular pitcher alone contains the whole ocean. How is our great work to be done if we are to be impeded and harassed on every side by partisans and zealots? It would be already half accomplished were the intelligent men, at least, of every sect and system, to feel and to confess that the little wee bit of truth they themselves own must necessarily be mingled with error, and that their neighbours' mistakes are, like their own, mixed with truth.

Free discussion, temperate, candid, undefiled by personalities and animosity, is, we think, the most efficacious means of getting rid of error and bringing out the underlying truth; and this applies to publications as well as to persons. It is open to a magazine to be tolerant or intolerant; it is open to it to err in almost every way in which an individual can err; and since every publication of the kind has a responsibility such as falls to the lot of few individuals, it behoves it to be ever on its guard, so that it may advance without fear and without reproach. All this is true in a special degree in the case of a theosophical publication, and *Lucifer* feels that it would be unworthy of that designation were it not true to the profession of the broadest tolerance and catholicity, even while pointing out to its brothers and neighbours the errors which they indulge in and follow. While thus

“TO THE READERS OF LUCIFER”

9

keeping strictly, in its editorials, and in articles by its individual editors, to the spirit and teachings of pure theosophy, it nevertheless frequently gives room to articles and letters which diverge widely from the esoteric teachings accepted by the editors, as also by the majority of theosophists. Readers, therefore, who are accustomed to find in magazines and party publications only such opinions and arguments as the editor believes to be unmistakably orthodox—from his peculiar standpoint—must not condemn any article in *Lucifer* with which they are not entirely in accord, or in which expressions are used that may be offensive from a sectarian or a *prudish* point of view, on the ground that such are unfitted for a theosophical magazine. They should remember that precisely because *Lucifer* is a theosophical magazine, it opens its columns to writers whose views of life and things may not only slightly differ from its own, but even be diametrically opposed to the opinion of the editors. The object of the latter is to elicit truth, not to advance the interest of any particular *ism*, or to pander to any hobbies, likes or dislikes, of any class of readers. It is only snobs and prigs who, disregarding the truth or error of the idea, cavil and strain merely over the expressions and words it is couched in. Theosophy, if meaning anything, means truth; and truth has to deal indiscriminately and in the same spirit of impartiality

with vessels of honour and of dishonour alike. No theosophical publication would ever dream of adopting the coarse—or shall we say terribly sincere—language of a Hosea or a Jeremiah; yet so long as those holy prophets are found in the Christian Bible, and the Bible is in every respectable, pious family, whether aristocratic or plebeian; and so long as the Bible is read with bowed head and in all reverence by young, innocent maidens and school-boys, why should our Christian critics fall foul of any phrase which may have to be used—if truth be spoken at all—in an occasional article upon a scientific subject? It is to be feared that the same sentences now found objectionable, because referring to Biblical subjects, would be loudly praised and applauded had they been directed against any gentile system of faith (*Vide*

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
January, 1888

10

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

certain missionary organs). A little charity, gentle readers—charity, and above all—*fairness* and JUSTICE.

Justice demands that when the reader comes across an article in this magazine which does not immediately approve itself to his mind by chiming in with his own peculiar ideas, he should regard it as a problem to solve rather than as a mere subject of criticism. Let him endeavour to learn the lesson which only opinions differing from his own can teach him. *Let him be tolerant, if not actually charitable*, and postpone his judgment till he extracts from the article the truth it must contain, adding this new acquisition to his store. One ever learns more from one's enemies than from one's friends; and it is only when the reader has credited this hidden truth to *Lucifer*, that he can fairly presume to put what he believes to be the errors of the article he does not like, to the debit account.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
January, 1888

A MODERN MAGICIAN

[REVIEW]

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 5, January, 1888, pp. 395-397]

[This review article of J. Fitzgerald Molloy's work entitled *A Modern Magician: A Romance* (3 vols. London: Ward and Downey, 1887. 8°) may not have been written by H. P. B., but it does contain certain sentences which are reminiscent of her style. It gives strong endorsement to the work and recommends it to the attention of Theosophists. We select the following sentence as being of importance:]

As regards Amerton's character, we see the natural, born, mystic turning aside and voluntarily taking upon himself, though warned, the bonds of married life. These become intolerable to him, and the unhappiness of two persons results. Occultism is a jealous mistress, and, once launched on that path, it is necessary to resolutely refuse to recognize any attempt to draw one back from it. Amerton wanted to crush out his natural tendencies to

ABSOLUTE MONISM; OR, MIND IS MATTER

11

occultism, and failed. It is as hard to draw back from them, and turn attention solely to the things of the world, as it is, when studying occultism, to turn our attention solely to the invisible regions, and neglect absolutely the physical world.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

January, 1888

ABSOLUTE MONISM; OR, MIND IS MATTER AND MATTER IS MIND

[REVIEW]

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 5, January, 1888, pp. 408-411]

[There may be some doubt as to the authorship of this review of a work by Sundaram Iyer, F.T.S. (Madras, 1887), but its general trend and phraseology suggest that it was written by H.P.B., especially as the subject-matter is of a kind that was pointed out by her on many other occasions.]

Under the above title the author issues an address delivered at the last convention of the delegates of the Theosophical Society at Adyar. Metaphysicians, who note with interest all criticisms of Western psychology from the Oriental standpoint, will welcome the appearance of this extremely able and instructive *brochure*, which constitutes the first instalment of Absolute Monism. The object of the writer is to discuss the point whether an examination of all theories, as to relations of mind and body, “does not lead us to the Unistic theory that Mind is Matter, and Matter is Mind.” He endeavours to merge the apparent dualism of subject and object into a fundamental unity:—

Is mind a product of organized matter? No for organized matter is only a combination of material particles, as is unorganized matter. How is it, then, that there is the manifestation of Mind in the one case, and not in the other? Can subjective facts ever emerge out of a group of molecules? Never; as many times never as there are molecules in the group. And why? Because Mind cannot issue from No Mind. (p. 13.)

The line of argument adopted *versus* Materialism—the doctrine that mental facts are the *resultant* of chemical changes in the brain; force and matter being the only Ultimates of Existence—is unquestionably forcible. Mind can never be resolved into a “by-product” of brain activity, for several valid reasons. In the first place, in its aspect of thought, it exhibits *concentration on an end, intelligence and interest* in the subject under consideration, all of which characteristics, according to Tyndall and Du Bois-Reymond, are necessarily absent from those remarshallings of atoms and molecules which are declared to “cerebrate out” mental phenomena! In the second place, the gulf between consciousness and molecular change has never been bridged; an admission to which the leading physicists and physiologists of the day lend all the weight of their authority. The terms “consciousness” and “matter” are expressive of things so utterly contrasted, that all attempts to deduce the former from the latter have met with signal discredit. Nevertheless, materialists assume the contrary, whenever the necessities of their philosophy demand it. Hence, we find men, like Büchner, admitting in one place that “in the relation of soul and

brain, phenomena occur which *cannot be explained by matter and force,*” and elsewhere resolving mind into the “*activity of the tissues of the brain,*” “a mode of motion”—contradictions, the flagrancy of which is enhanced by the fact that the same author invests the physical automaton Man with a power to control his actions! Lastly, the degradation of consciousness into “brain function” by constituting philosophers, theologians, scientists, and all alike “conscious automata”—(machines whose thoughts are determined *for*, not *by* their conscious Egos)—knocks away the basis of argument. The only resource becomes universal scepticism; a denial of the possibility of attaining truth. Can impartiality, correct thinking and agreement, be expected on the part of controversialists who form part of a comedy of Automata?

If mind is not inherent in matter, it cannot be evolved by mere nervous complexity. The combination of two

chemical elements cannot result in a compound in which something more than the constituent factors are present. It is sometimes urged that, since the properties of substances are often altogether changed in the course of chemical combinations—new ones arising with the temporary lapse of the old—consciousness may be explained as a “peculiar property” of matter under some of its conditions. Mr. Sundaram Iyer meets this objection ably. “Aquosity,” it is said, is a property of oxygen and hydrogen in combination, though not in isolation. To this he answers, “chemical properties are either purely subjective facts or objective-subjective ones” (p. 57). They exist only in the consciousness of the percipient, and represent no external and independent reality. Psychologists of the type of Huxley would do well to recall this fact, apart from the considerations springing from other data.

Our author is loud in his praises of *Panpsychism*, that phase of pantheism which regards all matter as saturated with a potential psyche. He speaks of the “catholicity, sublimity and beauty . . . not to say the philosophy, and logic, and truthfulness of this creed of thought.” It is, however, clear that some of the authorities he cites in support of this view, more especially Clifford, Tyndall, and Ueberweg, represent a phase of thought which is too materialistic to do justice to an elevated pantheistic concept. Clifford’s *conscious mind-stuff* sublimated materialism, and Ueberweg speaks of those “sensations” present in “inanimate” objects which are “concentrated” in the human brain, as if they represented so many substances to be weighed in scales. Instructive and thoughtful as is the discussion of this subject (pp. 32-63), its value would have been increased by a survey of the pantheistic schools of German speculation, so many of whose conclusions are absolutely at one with esoteric views as to the Logos and the metaphysics of consciousness.

After discussing the primary and secondary (so-called) qualities of matter as tabulated by Mill, Hamilton and others, Mr. Sundaram Iyer passes on the question: “What is force?”

Force *is* matter it may be related to matter in four ways:—firstly, it may be an extraneous power to matter, acting upon it from without; secondly, it may be an inherent power in matter, influencing it from within, but yet distinct from the substance of matter; thirdly, it may be an innate power in matter, influencing it from within, and not distinct from the substance of matter; or fourthly, it may be a function of the substance of matter.” (pp. 76-7.)

After an interesting criticism of current theories, he concludes that:—

Function is simply the phenomenal effect of the latent cause, namely force, but never force itself. This potential existence, which is in matter, *is a physical existence*. If not, it cannot, as shown before, produce any impression whatsoever upon or in the substance of matter.

Matter is force and force is matter. It is not quite evident, however, whether this position is strictly reconcilable with the remark that “the primary qualities of matter are all simplifiable into . . . extension and (its) motion (actual or possible).”

If force is a *physical existence*, and the real *substance* of matter at the same time, we get back no further into the mystery of what things-in-themselves really are. Physical existence remains the reality behind physical existence and the realization of matter and force, as aspects only of one basis, in no way simplifies the crux.

It is not clear, moreover, what is the exact meaning the author intends by the use of the word “force.” Is it motion—molar or molecular—or the unknown cause of motion? According to Professor Huxley, “force” is merely an expression used to denote the *cause* of motion, whatever that may be. We only *know* this cause in its *aspect* of motion, and cannot penetrate behind the veil in order to grasp the Noumenon of which motion is the phenomenal effect. The necessity, therefore, of recognising the fact that *motion* is all that falls within the cognizance of sense, forbids the (profane) scientist to use the term “force” as representative of anything but an abstraction. The question is complicated by the consideration that the *substantiality* of various so-called “forces” appears most probable, and that this substantiality becomes

objectively real to sense, only on a plane beyond this—the domain of matter in its order of physical differentiations.

The materialistic doctrine that force merely = a motion of matter, is contradicted by the fact that, as shown by Mill, *motion can be temporarily neutralized*. Lift a heavy weight on to a shelf and the mechanical energy expended in the act is latent in the potentiality of the weight to fall to the ground again. There is *no immediate equivalent*, as the attraction of the earth for the object remains the same (the now greater distance tending to diminish the amount, though in a very minute degree).

It may be further noted that, granting Mr. Sundaram Iyer’s definition of matter as “*extension pure and simple*,” to be correct (p. 112), it is difficult to understand how he predicates this barren content as endowed with *motion* (p. 83). What moves?

The rest of the *brochure* is taken up with some excellent criticism of current conceptions of atoms, space and heterogeneity (a creed now so sorely wounded by Mr. Crooke's "Protyle"). Dealing with one of the late Mr. G. H. Lewes' utterances, the author remarks with great truth: "By some mysterious law of occurrence the self-contradictions of the bulk of the erudite and enlightened are in point of gravity, palpableness, and number in direct proportion to their erudition and enlightenment." With how many contrasted dicta from the pages of our Büchners, Spencers, Bains etc., etc., could this conclusion be supported.

One word before we close. Is the title of the work well chosen? It appears to us the least satisfactory sentence which has been traced by the writer's pen. The definition of "mind as matter and matter as mind" not only offers no solution of the great psychological problem discussed, but does injustice to the contents of the work itself.

In the process of definition we "assemble representative examples of the phenomena," under investigation and "our work lies in generalizing these, in detecting community in the midst of difference." Now, there is *no community whatever* between mental and material facts. For as Professor Bain writes:

Extension is but the first of a long series of properties all present in matter, *all absent in mind*. . . . Our mental experience, our feelings and thoughts, have no *extension*, no *place*, no *form* * or *outline*, or *mechanical division* of parts; and we are incapable of attending to anything mental until we shut off the view of all that. †

The phenomenal contrast of mind and matter is not only at the root of our present constitution but an essential of our terrestrial consciousness. Duality is illusion in the ultimate analysis; but within the limits of a Universe-cycle or Great Manvantara it holds true. The *two* bases of manifested Being—the Logos (spirit) and Mulaprakriti (Matter, or rather its Noumenon), are unified in the absolute reality, but in the Manvantaric Maya, under space and time conditions, they *are contrasted though mutually interdependent aspects of the ONE CAUSE*.

* Nevertheless *objectively* viewed thoughts are actual entities to the occultist.

† *Mind and Body*, pp. 125 and 135.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
January, 1888

**THE CHURCH AND THE DOCTRINE OF
ATONEMENT**

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 5, January, 1888, pp. 412-414]

[Rev. T. G. Headley of the Church of England, in a letter to the Editor of *Lucifer*, describes how he has been boycotted for seventeen years by the officials of the Church for not believing in the doctrine of Atonement, as stated in the XXXIX Articles. Three different appeals on his part for a pulpit where he could preach freely were refused publication in the *Times*, on the ground that they were *inadmissible*. H. P. B. appends the following Note to Rev. Headley's letter:]

This persistent refusal is the more remarkable as other preachers are allowed to teach worse, *from an orthodox standpoint, of course*. Is it *inadmissible* "to explain the mystery of Christ Crucified," as the Rev. Mr. Headley is likely to, lest it should interfere with the explanation and



H.P. B.'s RESIDENCE 17, LANSDOWNE ROAD,

NOTTINGHILL, LONDON, ENGLAND

Picture taken in 1959, showing only minor
Alterations since 1887.

description of Jehovah—“*one with Christ Jesus*” in the orthodox dogma—by the Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A.? Says this truthful and cultured if not very pious orator:

At first the chief attributes of Satan were given to Jehovah. It was God who destroyed the world, hardened Pharaoh, tempted David, provoked to sin, and punished the sinner. This way of thinking lingered even as late as 700 B.C.: “I [the Lord] make peace and create evil” (*Isa.*, xlv, 7). We have an odd survival of this identification of God with the Devil in the word “*Deuce*,” which is none other than “*Deus*,” but which to us always means the Devil. As the Jew grew more spiritual he gradually transferred the devilish functions to a “Satan,” or accusing spirit. The transition point appears in comparing the early passage (*2 Sam.*, xxiv, 1), when *God* is said to “move” David to number the people, with the later (*1 Chron.*, xxi, 1), where *Satan* is said to be the instigator who “provoked” the numbering. But Satan is not yet the King Devil. We can take up our Bible and trace the gradual transformation of Satan from an accusing angel into the King Devil of popular theology.*

This, we believe, is an even more damaging teaching for the Orthodox Church than any theory about “Christ Crucified.” Mr. Headley seeks to prove Christ, the Rev. Haweis ridiculing and making away with the Devil, *destroys and makes away for ever with Jesus*, as Christ, also. For, as logically argued by Cardinal Ventura di Raulica, “*to demonstrate the existence of Satan, is to re-establish ONE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL DOGMAS OF THE CHURCH, which serves as a basis for Christianity, and, without which, Satan [and Jesus] would be but a name*”; or to put it in the still stronger terms of the pious Chevalier Gougenot des Mousseaux, “*The Devil is the chief pillar of Faith . . . if it was not for him, the Saviour, the Crucified, the Redeemer, would be but the most ridiculous of supernumeraries, and the Cross an insult to good sense.*” (See *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 14, and Vol. I, p. 103.)† Truly so. Were there no Devil,

* *The Key*, etc., p. 22.

† [Both passages are from des Mousseaux’s works: *Les hauts phénomènes de la magie*, Preface, p.v, where a letter from Cardinal Ventura di Raulica is quoted; and *Mœurs et pratiques des démons*, p. x.—*Compiler.*]

a Christ to save the World from him would be hardly wanted! Yet, the Rev. Haweis says:

I cannot now discuss the teaching of the N.T. on the King Devil, or I might show that Jesus did not endorse the popular view of one King Devil, and . . . notice the way in which our translators have played fast and loose with the words *Diabolus and Satan*; *

adding that the Tree and Serpent worship was an Oriental cult, “of which the narrative of Adam and Eve is a Semitic form.” Is this *admissible* orthodoxy?

* *The Key*, etc., p. 24.

† [This has reference to the second instalment of H.P.B.’s essay on “The Esoteric Character of the Gospels,” *Lucifer*, Vol. I, December, 1887, p. 300, footnote.—*Compiler.*]

‡ The remark made has never been meant as “an answer,” but simply as an observation that the word “Chrêstos” applied to a “good man,” a “human original,” and not to a “good God only.” If such was the intention of Mr. Massey, and he amplifies his idea elsewhere, it was not so amplified in his article in the *Agnostic Annual*. It is, therefore, simply a bare statement of facts referring to that particular article and no more.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

January, 1888

A NOTE OF EXPLANATION

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 5, January, 1888, pp. 418-421]

I would much rather suffer an unintentional misrepresentation of my meaning than take the trouble to reply, and have no desire to magnify small matters of difference. But a very critical friend calls my attention to certain statements and apparent discrepancies in "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels," on which I will beg leave to say a word.

I find it affirmed on p. 300, in a foot-note,† that "Mr. G. Massey is not correct in saying that ' . . . The Gnostic form of the name Chrêst, or Chrêstos, denotes the *Good God*, not a human original,' for it denotes the latter, *i.e.*, a good, holy man." But either the statement has no meaning as an answer to me, or it is based on a misunderstanding of mine. ‡ I was showing that the *original* Christ

A NOTE OF EXPLANATION

19

of the Gnosis was not one particular form of human personality, like the supposed historic Christ, and that the name denoted a divine, and not a human *original*. I was perfectly well aware, as your quotations show, that the name was *afterwards* conferred on the "good" as the Chrêstoi or Chrêstiani. Nor do I say, or anywhere imply, that the "*Karest*," or mummy-type of immortality *was* the *only form of the Christ*, as your quotations again will prove. I have written enough about the Gnostic Christ who was the Immortal Self in man, the reflection of, or emanation from, the divine nature in humanity, and in both sexes, not merely in one.* This is the Christ that never could become a one person or be limited to one sex. This you accept and preach; yet you can add "Still, the personage (Jesus) so addressed [by Paul]—wherever he lived—was a great Initiate and a 'Son of God.'"† But the Christos of Paul, being the Gnostic Christ, as you

I do not for one moment oppose Mr. Massey's conclusions, nor doubt his undeniable learning in the direction of those particular researches, *i.e.*, about the words "Christos" and "Chrêstos." What I say is, that he limits them to the negation of an historical Christ, and, for reasons no doubt very weighty, does not touch upon their principal esoteric meaning in the temple-phraseology of the Mysteries.—H.P.B.

* This is absolutely and pre eminently a Theosophical doctrine taught ever since 1875, when the Theosophical Society was founded.—H.P.B.

† This, I am afraid, is a misunderstanding (due, no doubt, to my own fault) on the part of our learned correspondent, of the meaning that was intended to be conveyed in the articles now criticized. If he goes to the trouble of reading over again the paragraph that misled him (see p. 307, 5th paragraph), he will, perhaps, see that it is so. That which was really meant was that, though the terms *Christos* and *Chrêstos* are generic surnames, still,

the personage so addressed (not by Paul, necessarily, but by any one), was a great Initiate and a “Son of God.” It is the name “Jesus,” placed in the sentence in parentheses that made it both clumsy and misleading. Whether Paul knew of Jehoshua Ben Pandira (and he must have heard of him), or not, he could never

admit (p. 301), it cannot be a personage named Jesus, or a great Initiate, who was addressed by him. It appears to me that in passages like these, you are giving away all that is worth contending for, and vouching for that which never has been, and never can be, proved. I have searched for Jesus many years in the Gospels and elsewhere without being able to catch hold of the hem of the garment of any human personality. Ben-Pandira we know a little of, but cannot make him out in the Christ of the Gospels. The Christ of the Gnosis can be identified, but not with any historic Jesus.

We do not go to the Christian Gospels to learn the true nature of the Christ, or the incarnation according to the Gnostic religion (I use this term in preference to yours of the “Wisdom-Religion,” as being more definite and explanatory; not as a religion, supposed by the *Idiotai* to have followed in the wake of Historic Christianity!). These were known in Egypt, more than six thousand years ago. When the monuments began, the Cult of the Supreme God Atum was extant. We know not how many aeons earlier, but six thousand years will do. Atum=Adam was the divine father of an eternal soul which was personated as his son, named Iu-em-hept (the Greek Imothos or Aesculapius), an image of whom used to be seen (on shelf 3,578 b. 1874), in the British Museum.* He was the second Atum=Adam,

have applied the surname used by him to Jesus or any other *historic* Christ. Otherwise his *Epistles* would not have been withheld and exiled as they were. The sentence which precedes the two incriminated [*sic*] statements, shows that no such thing, as understood by Mr. Massey, could have been really meant, as it is said “Occultism pure and simple finds the same mystic elements in the Christian as in other faiths, *though it rejects as emphatically its dogmatic and historic character.*” The two statements, *viz.*, that Jesus or Jehoshua Ben Pandira, *whenever he lived*, was a great Initiate and the “Son of God”—just as Apollonius of Tyana was—and that Paul never meant either him or any other living Initiate, but a metaphysical Christos present in, and *personal* to, every mystic Gnostic as to every initiated Pagan—are not at all irreconcilable. A man may know of several great Initiates, and yet place his own ideal on a far higher pedestal than any of these.
—H.P.B.

* [More correctly, Imouthês, z3m@b20], and ‘Imhôtep, in Egyptian. It has not been possible definitely to identify the figure to which

and is called the “Eternal Word” in the Ritual. In external phenomena this type represented the Solar God, re-born monthly or annually in the lunar orb, in human phenomena the Christ or Son of God as the essential and eternal soul in man. But he was neither a man nor an Initiate. He was just what the Logos, the Word of

Truth or Ma-Kheru, the Buddha or Christ is in other Cults. *

I cordially agree with “M,” a correspondent whom you quote, and wish that all our orthodox friends would as frankly face the facts.

H.P.B. refers. There are at present in the British Museum three bronze statuettes of 'Imhôtep, on view in the Fifth Egyptian Room, wall-case No. 216. They are small seated figures numbered 40666, 63800 and 64495.—*Compiler.*]

* Nor shall I dispute this statement in general. But this does not invalidate in one iota *my* claim. The temple priests assumed the names of the gods they served, and this is as well known a fact, as that the defunct Egyptian became an “Osiris”—was “osirified”—after his death. Yet Osiris was assuredly neither “man nor an Initiate,” but a being hardly recognised as such by the Royal Society of materialistic science. Why, then, could not an “Initiate,” who had succeeded in merging his spiritual being into the *Christos state*, be regarded as a Christos after his last and supreme initiation, just as he was called *Chrêstos* before that? Neither Plotinus, Porphyry nor Apollonius were Christians, yet, according to esoteric teaching, Plotinus realized this sublime state (of becoming or uniting himself with his *Christos*) six times, Apollonius of Tyana four times, while Porphyry reached the exalted state only once, when over sixty years of age. The Gnostics called the “Word” “Abraxas” and “Christos” indiscriminately, and by whatever name we may call it, whether Ma-Kheru, or Christos or Abraxas, it is all one. That mystic state which gives to our inner being the impulse that attracts “the soul towards its origin and centre, the Eternal good,” as Plotinus teaches, and makes of man a god, the Christos or the unknown made manifest, is a pre eminently theosophical condition. It belongs to the temple mysteries, and the teachings of the Neo-Platonists.—H.P.B.

If any historic Jesus ever did claim to be the Gnostic Christ made flesh * once for all, he would be the supremest impostor in history.

Let us define to ourselves very strictly what it is we do mean, or we shall introduce the direst confusion into the conflict, and we shall be unable to distinguish the face of friend from foe in the cloud of battle-dust which we may raise. What I find is, that Historic Christianity was based either upon the suppression or the perversion of all that *was* esoteric in Gnostic Christianity. And to bring any aid from the one to the support of the other is to try and re-establish with the left hand all that you are knocking down with the right.

I am also taken to task on page 177 for alluding to the Bible as a “magazine of falsehoods already exploded, or just going off,” by the writer who adds force to my words later on in characterizing these same writings as a “magazine of [wicked] falsehoods” (p. 178), † which was going farther than I went, who do set down as much to ignorance as to knavery. What I meant was, that the “Fall of Man” in the Old Testament, is a falsification of fable, now exploded, and that the redemption from that fall, which is promised in the New, whether by an “Initiate” or “Son of God” is a fraud based on the fable, and a falsehood that is going to be exploded. There is no call to mix up the *Book of the Dead*, the *Vedas*, or any other sacred writings, in this

matter. Each tub must stand on its own bottom, and the one that won't, can't hold water. †

GERALD MASSEY.

* “Christ made flesh,” would be a claim worse than imposture, as it would be *absurdity*, but a man of flesh assuming the *Christ-condition* temporarily, is indeed an occult, yet living, fact.—H.P.B.

† Just so, if it has been originally written to be accepted in its dead letter sense. But, as I entirely agree with Mr. Massey, that historic Christianity was based upon the suppression, and especially the *perversion* of that which was esoteric in gnosticism, it is difficult to see in what it is that we disagree? The perversion of esoteric facts in the gospels is not so cleverly done as to prevent the true occultist from reading the Gospel narratives between the lines.—H.P.B.

‡ If Mr. G. Massey kindly waits till the conclusion of “The Esoteric Character of the Gospels” to criticise the statements, he may perhaps arrive at the conviction that

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

23

P.S. By the by, I see the Adventists, and other misleading Delusionists are all agog just now about the wonderful fulfilment of prophecy, and corroboration of historic fact, that we are now witnessing. The “Star of Bethlehem” has re-appeared, so they say, to prove the truth of the Christian story. But, sad to say, it is not the star of Christ that is now visible in the south-east before sunrise every morning. It is Venus in her heliacal rising. It is Venus as the Maleess, or Lucifer as “Sun of the Morning.” This particular Star of Bethlehem—there are various others less brilliant and less noticeable—generally does return once every nineteen months or so, when the planet Venus is the Morning Star. Only the gaping camel-swallowers, who know all about the “Star of Bethlehem,” and the fulfilment of prophecy, are not up in Astronomy, and they will no doubt squirm and strain at this small gnat of real fact offered to them by way of an explanation.

G. M.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
January, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 5, January, 1888, pp. 406-7, 421-22]

Both the Idealism of Mr. Herbert Spencer, and the Hylo-Idealism of Dr. Lewins are more materialistic and atheistic than any of the honestly declared materialistic views—Büchner's and Moleschott's included.

we are not so far apart in our ideas upon this particular question as he seems to think. Of course my critic being an Egyptologist, opposed to the Aryan theory, and arriving at his conclusions only by what he finds in strictly authenticated and accepted documents—and I, as a Theosophist and an Occultist of a certain school, accepting my proofs on data which he rejects—*i.e.*, esoteric teachings—we can hardly agree upon every point. But the question is not whether there was or never was an *historical* Christ, or Jesus, between the years 1 and 33 A.D.—but simply were the Gospels of the gnostics (of Marcion and others, for instance) perverted later by Christians—esoteric allegories founded on *facts*, or simply meaningless fictions? I believe the former, and esoteric teachings explain many of the allegories.—H.P.B.

A few years—and, who knows? perhaps only few months more, and Protestant England will have reverend scientists explaining to their congregations from the pulpits that Adam and Eve were but the “missing link”—*two tailless baboons*.

Hence the Spirit of *Non-Separateness* in esoteric philosophy must be the ONE *truth*.
[What the Ego is, *all is*] Only this “Ego” is *universal*, not *individual*: *Absolute* Consciousness, not the *human* Brain.

[The highest and the lowliest are ever thus akin. . .] Then why not term the philosophy “*High-Low-Idealism*” *vice* “Hylo-Idealism”?

[. . . everything being, not so much cleansed of God, as very THEOBROMA, God's food and nutrient element. . .] “Theobroma”—the same as *cacao-butter*. We take exception to *the phraseology*, not to Dr. Lewins' ideas.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
January, 1888

CHINESE SHADOWS

(From the London Correspondent of *Novoye Vremya*)

[*Novoye Vremya*, St. Petersburg, No. 4293, Wednesday,
February 10(22), 1888]

[Translated from the original Russian text]

Vicars of the Anglican Church here are at loggerheads with their own Bishops. And on what a subject, if you please? On the subject of ballet girls. The Bible and the ballet are to be harmonized. The Reverends Haweis and Stewart Headlam, socialists and well-known preachers, stand firm for the right of the clergymen and the clergy in general, to frequent ballet theatres daily, and from the pulpit both praise the character of the dancers. However, the Bishop of London, Dr. Temple is of the opinion that as long as the dancers appear in such short dresses, the

CHINESE SHADOWS

25

clergy should not be so regularly in attendance at ballet performances, as are many vicars, with Stewart Headlam at their head. Headlam—the same who recently led the funeral procession of A. Linnell—took offence at such a reactionary view of his superior. To the Bishop's public rebuke in *The Times*, he replied in an open letter in *Pall Mall*. The dancing girls as a whole also took offence, and defended their outraged honour—in the shape of skirts that were too short—in a similar letter and in the same paper. The Primate of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury, took sides with the Bishop of London, and a brush fire swept the whole of the United Kingdom and has been burning since last September. Nothing can be done! The Primate (something similar to the Metropolitan) has no right to unfrock a pastor. Once a man becomes a clergyman in a Protestant Church, he is going to die one, were he even to marry all the ballet dancers and cut the throats of all his mothers-in-law; he would remain a “reverend” even at forced labour.

The sermons of Headlam and of Haweis, his Rector and immediate superior, are as touching as they are instructive. With the exception of the “Salvation Army” of General Booth, their congregations are the most fashionable and numerous. It is difficult to choose between the three shows, so original and amazing are they all three. If you go to Haweis—laughter and bravos resound instead of “Amens,” and the lovely sex blushes, but

nevertheless listens and laughs. The very cream of the aristocratic orthodox faithful gather there; while at General Booth's, according to his own proud declaration, the dregs of Society are both on the platform and among the public. Now what is the difference between these gatherings? The "Army" sings about the Christ to the tune of racy songs, while the flock of Haweis listens to the racy sermons of their preacher, with prayer books in their prayerfully folded hands. . . . If any among the Russian readers wishes to assure himself of this, let him read the report

of any of his sermons in the London *World*. In one of them, the *World* writes:

Both men and women blushed listening to the sermon about the moral superiority of actors and actresses, about the naked inhabitants of the Orient, the half-undressed ladies of the London balls, the naked naiad of the aquarium, the picturesque suits of the bathers at seashore bathing establishments, and about the beauties of the ballet.

Both of the famous preachers, Haweis and Headlam, have transformed their pulpits into oratorical tribunes similar to ancient Athens, where feminine beauty in general, and Aspasia and Company in particular, were defended. In both pulpits the *corps de ballet* is glorified. "Is it possible," asks the first-named reverend, "that God would have created woman's body so that it would be sinful to look at it?" (*sic*). In the opinion of the preacher, "a well-shaped ballet dancer would sin in hiding God's handiwork, and she should, for the glory of God, appear on the stage covered merely by her own personal virtue," and with nothing else. It is sinful for a pure-minded worshipper of feminine beauty to chime in with the hypocrites who require more garments on the dancers, because this is tantamount to "giving preference to textile fabrics made with human hands, rather than to the body of woman, created by the hand of the Almighty," *i.e.*, a preference of "Manchester industrialists to the Creator of the heavens and the earth" (*sic*). What logic?

And this is the new turn of affairs in the State Religion of Great Britain, and the reform hatched by its liberal clergy.

Drop in now upon "General Booth," in one of the numerous and enormous halls which they call "prayer barracks" of the Salvation Army, and watch the up-to-date method and ways of that salvation. As you enter, your head will split from the noise of tambourines, rattle-boxes and "divine" hymns, to the tune of the operettas of Offenbach. On the stage—or the platform, if you like

—a whole battalion of every rank, from ordinary private and sergeant, to major and colonel in skirts and little hats. A coloured scarf thrown over the shoulder with mysterious signs on it shows to the initiated the rank of the warrior who wears it. Officers of the male sex have scarves also, but are distinguished by the abundance of bright pompons, rosettes and choux made of satin ribbons upon often dirty and worn out uniforms. Negroes, Hindus and other coloured gentlemen show their teeth to the public and roll their eyes to the ceiling. As if bitten by a tarantula or in a fit of St. Vitus dance, this rabble shudders, grimaces and plays the buffoon during the preliminary inner prayer Those praying call the public to Christ, dancing and jumping to the sound of their own traditional rhythms. It is enough to hear such words in their songs as: “My Jesus is a jolly old boy” (*sic*), to become convinced that this army of Christians is electrified not by the name of Christ, but by purely psycho-physiological means, and an awful excitement of the nervous system, and that those among them who are really sincere are miserable psychopaths, while the others are acting under the influence of a temporary intoxication from noise, rapid motion and fancied exultation.

The “General” himself is a fat old man, as healthy as a bull, who started his life as a boy in a slaughter-house, and continued as a butcher clerk. He gets up and raises his hands in theatrical manner, as if blessing the public; in reality he is magnetizing it, befoggs it and searches for a nervous subject. Having observed a “suitable person,” he centres upon him all his attention, and then begins a very curious show, for anyone who is familiar with the methods of mesmerizers. The subject soon feels the heavy gaze of the “General” upon him, as if pinning him down, and begins nervously to fidget. If, against expectation, the subject is too weak to be handled all alone, the General forces the rest of the public to act in accord with him. He knows human nature through and through, and plays on it, striking human feelings and nerves like a pianist strikes the keys of the piano. *Nolens volens*, the public, without noticing it, helps him openly, for the sake of

momentary fun, as the General loudly declares that here is a man—man or woman—whose heart has been touched by the blessing from on high, but who is yet ashamed to declare it in everyone’s hearing. The wretched victim, feeling 10,000 eyes directed upon him from the crowd, becomes confused, loses his head and, rising, begins slowly to move in the direction of the platform. Like a bird glamorized by the snake’s gaze, the victim moves forward, and is being unconsciously pushed from three sides by an interested public. When at the steps of the stage, he is seized by dozens of the brave warriors’ hands, and is placed in a semi-conscious state before the ramp. From that moment he becomes for the rest of the evening, if not for longer, the property of the “army,” its new recruit.

The victim is forthwith asked publicly to confess his sins for the edification of the other sinners not yet converted. If the “new convert” should become obstinate, or actually not know what to declare publicly, then the members of the chorus throw themselves on

their knees and begin to pray for the inveterate sinner (to the tune, let us say, of the appeal of Calhas to Jupiter in the “Beautiful Helen”), so as to touch his heart. . . . It is usually the brain, not the heart of the victim that is touched, and at once there is gathered an abundant harvest of cheques, sovereigns, and occasionally hundreds of pounds sterling.

In one evening last week several dozen proselytes were made, and the treasury received about 11,000 pounds, out of which 10,500 pounds were subscribed by a wealthy soap-maker.

As already stated, the army, with very few exceptions, is made up of the dregs of Society; of repentant, and more often not so repentant, vagabonds, thieves and night-fairies from dark alleys. The General himself told a wealthy lady of my acquaintance, that he must, in order to keep the discipline and to have the army constantly in hand, keep it in a state of constant psycho-physiological intoxication! For this reason, much is allowed to

the army and much more yet is forgiven. That much is obvious, namely, that according to official statistics, wherever a part of the army may be settled, whatever town or community, the number of illegitimate births rises by some 35% in the first year. Such little peccadillos are playing into the hands of the General. They constantly give occasion for new “repentance,” and thus uphold in the warriors the religious flame, which otherwise would have gone out long ago. Abroad, and even in England itself, they believe naively that the Salvation Army is a religious brotherhood (!). Curious aberration! In the United Kingdom alone there are 450,000, and in London 280,000 people belonging to the Army. Not before the XIXth century has passed into eternity, will the Englishmen probably understand their mistake. . . . The Salvation Army is in reality a political society under the mask of religious striving. But this is known but to a few, those who hold the side-wires attached to the basic harness of Booth in their hands. The General holds the reins of the army, and the leaders of the “Sons of the Morning”—members of a society as yet little known—have fastened their invisible threads to his strong traces. So far both are rushing at full speed merely around the vicious circle of their own seemingly special arena, to the great edification of the fanatics. The time will come, when the agile tamer of two-legged animals, known under the comical title of “General,” will release his flock in the name of Christ, and will give it the freedom to subject to fire or sword this or another party. Anarchists and “sons of the morning” congratulate themselves secretly that the “General” is on their side. . . . Yes! No wonder that the New Dispensationists use nothing but Biblical expressions at public meetings, while laughing in the company of friends a. the Bible and its teachings, believing in them just about as much as does the Dalai-lama.

* [All of H. P. Blavatsky's contributions to Russian periodicals were signed in this manner. We leave it in its exact phonetic transliteration from the Russian. It is uncertain whether H.P.B. meant

Collected Writings VOLUME IX
February, 1888

30

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

“WHAT IS TRUTH?”

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 6, February, 1888, pp. 425-433]

“*Truth* is the Voice of Nature and of time—
Truth is the startling monitor *within us*—
Naught is without it, it comes from the stars,
The golden sun, and every breeze that blows. . .”

—WM. THOMPSON BACON. *

“. Fair Truth’s immortal sun
Is sometimes hid in clouds; not that her light
Is in itself defective, but obscured
By my weak prejudice, imperfect Faith
And all the thousand causes which obstruct
The growth of goodness.”

—HANNAH MORE. †

“What is Truth?” asked Pilate of one who, if the claims of the Christian Church are even approximately correct, must have known it. But He kept silent. And the truth which He did not divulge, remained unrevealed, for his later followers as much as for the Roman Governor. The silence of Jesus, however, on this and other occasions, does not prevent his present followers from acting as though they had received the ultimate and absolute Truth itself; and from ignoring the fact that only such Words of Wisdom had been given to them as contained a share of the truth, itself concealed in parables and dark, though beautiful, sayings. ‡

the first word to be *Râdhâ*, “prosperity,” or “success,” the name of a celebrated cowherdess or Gopî, beloved by Kîshîṣa, and a principal personage in the poem *Gîta-govinda*, who was later worshipped as a goddess and regarded as an Avatâra of Lakshmî, as Kîshîṣa was of Vishnu; or whether the Russian phonetic form was meant for *râddha*, which means “accomplished, prepared, ready,” and even “perfect in magical power” or “initiated.”—*Compiler*.]

* [Thoughts in Solitude.]

† [Daniel: A Sacred Drama, Part II, 98-103.]

‡ Jesus says to the “Twelve”—“Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God; but *unto them that are without, all things are done in parables,*” etc. (*Mark*, iv, II).

This policy led gradually to dogmatism and assertion. Dogmatism in churches, dogmatism in science, dogmatism everywhere. The possible truths, hazily perceived in the world of abstraction, like those inferred from observation and experiment in the world of matter, are forced upon the profane multitudes, too busy to think for themselves, under the form of *Divine revelation* and *Scientific authority*. But the same question stands open from the days of Socrates and Pilate down to our own age of wholesale negation: is there such a thing as *absolute truth* in the hands of any one party or man? Reason answers, “there cannot be.” There is no room for absolute truth upon any subject whatsoever, in a world as finite and conditioned as man is himself. But there are relative truths, and we have to make the best we can of them.

In every age there have been Sages who had mastered the absolute and yet could teach but relative truths. For none yet, born of mortal woman in *our* race, has, or could have given out, the whole and the final truth to another man, for every one of us has to find that (to him) final knowledge *in* himself. As no two minds can be absolutely alike, each has to receive the supreme illumination *through* itself, according to its capacity, and from no *human* light. The greatest adept living can reveal of the Universal Truth only so much as the mind he is impressing it upon can assimilate, and no more. *Tot homines, quot sententiae*—is an immortal truism. The sun is one, but its beams are numberless; and the effects produced are beneficent or maleficent, according to the nature and constitution of the objects they shine upon. Polarity is universal, but the polariser lies in our own consciousness. In proportion as our consciousness is elevated towards absolute truth, so do we men assimilate it more or less absolutely. But man’s consciousness again, is only the sunflower of the earth. Longing for the warm ray, the plant can only turn to the sun, and move round and round in following the course of the unreachable luminary: its roots keep it fast to the soil, and half its life is passed in the shadow. . . .

Still each of us can relatively reach the Sun of Truth even on this earth, and assimilate its warmest and most

direct rays, however differentiated they may become after their long journey through the physical particles in space To achieve this, there are two methods. On the physical plane we may use our mental polariscope; and, analyzing the properties of each ray, choose the purest. On the plane of spirituality, to reach the Sun of Truth we must work in dead earnest for the development of our higher nature. We know that by paralyzing gradually within ourselves the appetites of the lower personality, and thereby deadening the voice of the purely physiological mind—that mind which depends upon, and is inseparable from, its medium or *vehicle*, the organic brain—the animal man in us may make room for the spiritual; and once aroused from its latent state, the highest spiritual senses and perceptions

grow in us in proportion, and develop *pari passu* with the “divine man.” This is what the great adepts, the Yogis in the East and the Mystics in the West, have always done and are still doing.

But we also know, that with a few exceptions, no man of the world, no materialist, will ever believe in the existence of such adepts, or even in the possibility of such a spiritual or psychic development. “The (ancient) fool hath said in his heart, There is no God”; the modern says, “There are no adepts on earth, they are figments of your diseased fancy.” Knowing this we hasten to reassure our readers of the Thomas Didymus type. We beg them to turn in this magazine to reading more congenial to them; say to the miscellaneous papers on Hylo-Idealism, by various writers.*

* *E.g.*, to the little article “Autocentricism”—on the same “philosophy,” or again, to the apex of the Hylo-Idealist pyramid in this Number. It is a letter of protest by the learned Founder of the School in question, against a *mistake* of ours. He complains of our “coupling” his name with those of Mr. Herbert Spencer, Darwin, Huxley, and others, on the question of atheism and materialism, as the said lights in the psychological and physical sciences are considered by Dr. Lewins too flickering, too “compromising” and weak, to deserve the honourable appellation of Atheists or even Agnostics. See “Correspondence” in Double Column, and the reply by “The Adversary.”

“WHAT IS TRUTH?”

33

For *Lucifer* tries to satisfy its readers of whatever “school of thought,” and shows itself equally impartial to Theist and Atheist, Mystic and Agnostic, Christian and Gentile. Such articles as our editorials, the Comments on *Light on the Path*, etc., etc.—are not intended for Materialists. They are addressed to Theosophists, or readers who know in their hearts that Masters of Wisdom *do* exist: and, though *absolute* truth is not on earth and has to be searched for in higher regions, that there still are, even on this silly, ever-whirling little globe of ours, some things that are not even dreamt of in Western philosophy.

To return to our subject. It thus follows that, though “general *abstract* truth is the most precious of all blessings” for many of us, as it was for Rousseau, we have, meanwhile, to be satisfied with relative truths. In sober fact, we are a poor set of mortals at best, ever in dread before the face of even a relative truth, lest it should devour ourselves and our petty little preconceptions along with us. As for an absolute truth, most of us are as incapable of seeing it as of reaching the moon on a bicycle. Firstly, because absolute truth is as immovable as the mountain of Mohammed, which refused to disturb itself for the prophet so that he had to go to it himself. And we have to follow his example if we would approach it even at a distance. Secondly, because the kingdom of absolute truth is not of this world, while we are too much of it. And thirdly, because notwithstanding that in the poet’s fancy man is

“ the abstract
Of all perfection, which the workmanship

Of heaven hath modelled.”

in reality he is a sorry bundle of anomalies and paradoxes, an empty wind bag inflated with his own importance, with contradictory and easily influenced opinions. He is at once an arrogant and a weak creature, which, though in constant dread of some authority, terrestrial or celestial, will yet—

“ like an angry ape,
Play such fantastic tricks before high Heaven
As make the angels weep.” *

* [Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, Act 2, scene 2.]

Now, since truth is a multifaced jewel, the facets of which it is impossible to perceive all at once; and since, again, no two men, however anxious to discern truth, can see even one of those facets alike, what can be done to help them to perceive it? As physical man, limited and trammelled from every side by illusions, cannot reach truth by the light of his terrestrial perceptions, we say—develop in you the *inner* knowledge. From the time when the Delphic oracle said to the enquirer “Man, know thyself,” no greater or more important truth was ever taught. Without such perception, man will remain ever blind to even many a relative, let alone absolute, truth. Man has to *know himself, i.e.,* acquire the *inner* perceptions which never deceive, before he can master any absolute truth. Absolute truth is *the symbol of Eternity*, and no *finite* mind can ever grasp the eternal, hence, no truth in its fulness can ever dawn upon it. To reach the state during which man sees and senses it, we have to paralyze the senses of the external man of clay. This is a difficult task, we may be told, and most people will, at this rate, prefer to remain satisfied with relative truths, no doubt. But to approach even terrestrial truths requires, first of all, *love of truth for its own sake*, for otherwise no recognition of it will follow. And who loves truth in this age for its own sake? How many of us are prepared to search for, accept, and carry it out, in the midst of a society in which anything that would achieve success *has to be built on appearances, not on reality, on self-assertion, not on intrinsic value?* We are fully aware of the difficulties in the way of receiving truth. The fair heavenly maiden descends only on a (to her) congenial soil—the soil of an impartial, unprejudiced mind, illuminated by pure Spiritual Consciousness; and both are truly rare dwellers in civilized lands. In our century of steam and electricity, when man lives at a maddening speed that leaves him barely time for reflection, he allows himself usually to be drifted down from cradle to grave, nailed to the Procrustean bed of custom and conventionality. Now conventionality—pure and simple—is a congenital LIE, as it is in every case a “*simulation* of feelings according to a received

standard” (F. W. Robertson’s definition); and where there is any simulation *there cannot be any truth*. How profound the remark made by Byron, that “truth is a gem that is found at a great depth; whilst on the surface of this world all things are weighed *by the false scales of custom*,” is best known to those who are forced to live in the stifling atmosphere of such social conventionalism, and who, even when willing and anxious to learn, dare not accept the truths they long for, for fear of the ferocious Moloch called Society.

Look around you, reader; study the accounts given by world-known travellers, recall the joint observations of literary thinkers, the data of science and of statistics. Draw the picture of modern society, of modern politics, of modern religion and modern life in general before your mind’s eye. Remember the ways and customs of every cultured race and nation under the sun. Observe the doings and the moral attitude of people in the civilized centres of Europe, America, and even of the far East and the colonies, everywhere where the white man has carried the “benefits” of so-called civilization. And now, having passed in review all this, pause and reflect, and then name, *if you can*, that blessed *Eldorado*, that exceptional spot on the globe, *where TRUTH is the honoured guest, and LIE and SHAM the ostracised outcasts*? You CANNOT. Nor can any one else, unless he is prepared and determined to add his mite to the mass of falsehood that reigns supreme in every department of national and social life. “Truth!” cried Carlyle, “truth, though the heavens crush me for following her, no falsehood, though a whole celestial Lubberland were the prize of Apostasy.” Noble words, these. But how many think, and how many will *dare* to speak as Carlyle did, in our nineteenth century day? Does not the gigantic appalling majority prefer to a man the “paradise of do-nothings,” the *pays de Cocagne* of heartless selfishness? It is this majority that recoils terror-stricken before the most shadowy outline of every new and unpopular truth, out of mere cowardly fear, lest Mrs. Harris should denounce, and Mrs. Grundy condemn, its converts to the torture of being rent piecemeal by her murderous tongue.

SELFISHNESS, the first-born of Ignorance, and the fruit of the teaching which asserts that for every newly-born infant a new soul, *separate and distinct* from the Universal Soul, is “created”—this Selfishness is the impassable wall between the *personal* Self and Truth. It is the prolific mother of all human vices, *Lie* being born out of the necessity for dissembling, and *Hypocrisy* out of the desire to mask *Lie*. It is the fungus growing and strengthening with age in every human heart in which it has devoured all better feelings. Selfishness kills every noble impulse in our natures, and is the one deity, fearing no faithlessness or desertion from its votaries. Hence, we see it reign supreme in the world and in so-called fashionable society. As a result, we live, and move, and have our being in

this god of darkness under his trinitarian aspect of Sham, Humbug, and Falsehood, called RESPECTABILITY.

Is this Truth and Fact, or is it slander? Turn whichever way you will, and you find, from the top of the social ladder to the bottom, deceit and hypocrisy at work for dear Self's sake, in every nation as in every individual. But nations, by tacit agreement, have decided that selfish motives in politics shall be called "noble national aspiration, patriotism," etc.; and the citizen views it in his family circle as "domestic virtue." Nevertheless, Selfishness, whether it breeds desire for aggrandizement of territory, or competition in commerce at the expense of one's neighbour, can never be regarded as a virtue. We see smooth-tongued DECEIT and BRUTE FORCE—the *Jachin* and *Boaz* of every International Temple of Solomon—called Diplomacy, and we call it by its right name. Because the diplomat bows low before these two pillars of national glory and politics, and puts their masonic symbolism "in [cunning] strength shall this my house be established" into daily practice; *i.e.*, gets by deceit what he cannot obtain by force—shall we applaud him? A diplomat's qualification—"dexterity or skill in securing advantages"—for one's own country at the expense of other countries, can hardly be achieved by speaking *truth*, but verily by a wily and deceitful tongue; and, therefore, *Lucifer* calls such action—a *living*, and an evident LIE.

"WHAT IS TRUTH?"

37

But it is not in politics alone that custom and selfishness have agreed to call deceit and lie virtue, and to reward him who lies best with public statues. Every class of Society lives on LIE, and would fall to pieces without it. Cultured, God-and-law-fearing aristocracy being as fond of the forbidden fruit as any plebeian, is forced to lie from morn to noon in order to cover what it is pleased to term its "little peccadillos," but which TRUTH regards as gross immorality. Society of the middle classes is honeycombed with false smiles, false talk, and mutual treachery. For the majority religion has become a thin tinsel veil thrown over the corpse of spiritual faith. The master goes to church to deceive his servants; the starving curate—preaching what he has ceased to believe in—hoodwinks his bishop; the bishop—his God. *Dailies*, political and social, might adopt with advantage for their motto Georges Dandin's * immortal query—"Lequel de nous deux trompe-t-on ici?"—Even Science, once the anchor of the salvation of Truth, has ceased to be the temple of *naked* Fact. Almost to a man the Scientists strive now only to force upon their colleagues and the public the acceptance of some personal hobby, of some new-fangled theory, which will shed lustre on their name and fame. A Scientist is as ready to suppress damaging evidence against a current scientific hypothesis in our times, as a missionary in heathen-land, or a preacher at home, to persuade his congregation that modern geology is a lie, and evolution but vanity and vexation of spirit.

Such is the actual state of things in 1888 A.D., and yet we are taken to task by certain papers for seeing this year in more than gloomy colours!

Lie has spread to such extent—supported as it is by custom and conventionalities—that

even chronology forces people to lie. The suffixes A.D. and B.C. used after the dates of the year by Jew and Heathen, in European and even Asiatic lands, by the Materialist and the Agnostic as

* [Principal character in Molière's comedy by that name; it is in three acts, written in prose, and was first performed on the 19th of July, 1660.—*Compiler.*]

much as by the Christian, at home, are—a *lie* used to sanction another LIE.

Where then is even relative truth to be found? If, so far back as the century of Democritus, she appeared to him under the form of a goddess lying at the very bottom of a well, so deep that it gave but little hope for her release; under the present circumstances we have a certain right to believe her hidden, at least, as far off as the ever invisible *dark* side of the moon. This is why, perhaps, all the votaries of hidden truths are forthwith set down as lunatics. However it may be, in no case and under no threat shall *Lucifer* be ever forced into pandering to any universally and tacitly recognised, and as universally practised lie, but will hold to fact, pure and simple, trying to proclaim truth whensoever found, and under no cowardly mask. Bigotry and intolerance may be regarded as orthodox and sound policy, and the encouraging of social prejudices and personal hobbies at the cost of truth, as a wise course to pursue in order to secure success for a publication. Let it be so. The Editors of *Lucifer* are Theosophists, and their motto is chosen: *Vera pro gratiis*.

They are quite aware that *Lucifer's* libations and sacrifices to the goddess Truth do not send a sweet savoury smoke into the noses of the lords of the press, nor does the bright "Son of the Morning" smell sweet in their nostrils. He is ignored when not abused as—*veritas odium parit*. Even his friends are beginning to find fault with him. They cannot see *why it should not be a purely Theosophical magazine*, in other words, why it refuses to be dogmatic and bigoted. Instead of devoting every inch of space to theosophical and occult teachings, it opens its pages "to the publication of the most grotesquely heterogeneous elements and conflicting doctrines." This is the chief accusation, to which we answer—why not? Theosophy is divine knowledge, and knowledge is truth; every *true* fact, every sincere word are thus part and parcel of Theosophy. One who is skilled in divine alchemy, or even approximately blessed with the gift of the perception of truth, will find and extract it from an erroneous as much as from a correct statement. However small the particle of

gold lost in a ton of rubbish, it is the noble metal still, and worthy of being dug out even at the price of some extra trouble. As has been said, it is often as useful to know what a thing *is not*, as to learn what it *is*. The average reader can hardly hope to find any fact in a sectarian publication under all its aspects, *pro* and *con*, for either one way or the other its presentation is sure to be biased, and the scales helped to incline to that side to which its editor's special policy is directed. A Theosophical magazine is thus, perhaps, the only publication where one may hope to find, at any rate, the unbiased, if still only approximate truth and fact. Naked truth is reflected in *Lucifer* under its many aspects, for no philosophical or religious views are excluded from its pages. And, as every philosophy and religion, however incomplete, unsatisfactory, and even foolish some may be occasionally, must be based on a truth and fact of some kind the reader has thus the opportunity of comparing, analyzing, and choosing from the several philosophies discussed therein. *Lucifer* offers as many facets of the One universal jewel as its limited space will permit, and says to its readers: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve: whether the gods that were on the other side of the flood which submerged man's reasoning powers and divine knowledge, or the gods of the Amorites of *custom* and *social falsehood*, or again, the Lord of (the highest) Self—the bright destroyer of the dark power of illusion?" Surely it is that philosophy that tends to diminish, instead of adding to, the sum of human misery, which is the best.

At all events, the choice is there, and for this purpose only have we opened our pages to every kind of contributor. Therefore do you find in them the views of a Christian clergyman who believes in his God and Christ, but rejects the wicked interpretations and the enforced dogmas of his ambitious proud Church, along with the doctrines of the Hylo-Idealist, who denies God, soul, and immortality, and believes in nought save himself. The rankest Materialists will find hospitality in our journal; aye, even those who have not scrupled to fill pages of it with sneers and personal remarks upon ourselves, and

***Collected Writings* VOLUME IX**
February, 1888

40

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

abuse of the doctrines of Theosophy, so dear to us. When a journal of *free thought*, conducted by an Atheist, inserts an article by a Mystic or Theosophist in praise of his occult views and the mystery of Parabrahman, and passes on it only a few casual remarks, then shall we say *Lucifer* has found a rival. When a Christian periodical or missionary organ accepts an article from the pen of a freethinker deriding belief in Adam and his rib, and passes criticism on Christianity—its editor's faith—in meek silence, then it will have become worthy of *Lucifer*, and may be said truly to have reached that degree of tolerance when it may be placed on a level with any Theosophical publication.

But so long as none of these organs does something of the kind, they are all sectarian, bigoted, intolerant, and can never have an idea of truth and justice. They may throw innuendoes against *Lucifer* and its editors, they cannot affect either. In fact, the editors of that magazine feel proud of such criticism and accusations, as they are witnesses to the absolute absence of bigotry, or arrogance of any kind in theosophy, the result of the divine beauty of the doctrines it preaches. For, as said, Theosophy allows a hearing and a fair chance to all. It deems no views—if sincere—entirely destitute of truth. It respects thinking men, to whatever class of thought they may belong. Ever ready to oppose ideas and views which can only create confusion without benefiting philosophy, it leaves their expounders personally to believe in whatever they please, and does justice to their ideas when they are good. Indeed, the conclusions or deductions of a philosophic writer may be entirely opposed to our views and the teachings we expound; yet, his premises and statements of facts may be quite correct, and other people may profit by the adverse philosophy, even if we ourselves reject it, believing we have something higher and still nearer to the truth. In any case, our profession of faith is now made plain, and all that is said in the foregoing pages both justifies and explains our editorial policy.

To sum up the idea, with regard to absolute and relative truth, we can only repeat what we said before. *Outside a*

“WHAT IS TRUTH?”

41

certain highly spiritual and elevated state of mind, during which Man is at one with the UNIVERSAL MIND—he can get nought on earth but relative truth, or truths, from whatsoever philosophy or religion. Were even the goddess who dwells at the bottom of the

well to issue from her place of confinement, she could give man no more than he can assimilate. Meanwhile, every one can sit near that well—the name of which is KNOWLEDGE—and gaze into its depths in the hope of seeing Truth's fair image reflected, at least, on the dark waters. This, however, as remarked by Richter, presents a certain danger. Some truth, to be sure, may be occasionally reflected as in a mirror on the spot we gaze upon, and thus reward the patient student. But, adds the German thinker, "I have heard that some philosophers in seeking for Truth, to pay homage to her, have seen their own image in the water and adored it instead."

It is to avoid such a calamity—one that has befallen every founder of a religious or philosophical school—that the editors are studiously careful not to offer the reader only those truths which they find reflected in their own personal brains. They offer the public a wide choice, and refuse to show bigotry and intolerance, which are the chief landmarks on the path of Sectarianism. But, while leaving the widest margin possible for comparison, our opponents cannot hope to find *their faces* reflected on the clear waters of our *Lucifer*, without remarks or just criticism upon the most prominent features thereof, if in contrast with theosophical views.

This, however, only within the cover of the public magazine, and so far as regards the merely intellectual aspect of philosophical truths. Concerning the deeper spiritual, and one may almost say religious, beliefs, no true Theosophist ought to degrade these by subjecting them to public discussion, but ought rather to treasure and hide them deep within the sanctuary of his innermost soul. Such beliefs and doctrines should never be rashly given out, as they risk unavoidable profanation by the rough handling of the indifferent and the critical. Nor ought they to be embodied in any publication except as

hypotheses offered to the consideration of the thinking portion of the public. Theosophical truths, when they transcend a certain limit of speculation, had better remain concealed from public view, for the "evidence of things not seen" is no evidence save to him who sees, hears, and senses it. It is not to be dragged outside the "Holy of Holies," the temple of the impersonal divine *Ego*, or the indwelling SELF. For, while every fact outside *its* perception can, as we have shown, be, at best, only a relative truth, a ray from the absolute truth can reflect itself only in the pure mirror of its own flame—our highest SPIRITUAL CONSCIOUSNESS. And how can the darkness (of illusion) comprehend the LIGHT that shineth in it?

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

February, 1888

FOOTNOTES TO “THE SOLDIER’S DAUGHTER”

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 6, February, 1888, pp. 434-439]

[Rev. T. G. Headley writes an article in which he takes exception to various instances of the spilling of blood as related in the Old Testament, such as the assassination of Jephthah’s daughter, in *Judges*, xi; he strongly feels that the whole subject of Atonement should be reconsidered. H.P.B. appends a number of footnotes to various expressions of the writer].

[Jephthah is mockingly told that he is the fiend who must sacrifice his child . . . that he has no one to blame but himself, for having made the vow. . . . Who could he, or they be, who would require the fulfilling of it?] Jehovah, of course, in his own national character of Baal, Moloch, Typhon, etc. The final and conclusive identification of the “Lord God” of Israel with Moloch, we find in the last chapter of *Leviticus*, concerning *things devoted not to be redeemed* “a man shall devote unto the Lord of all that he hath, *both of man and beast*. . . . None devoted, which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed; *but shall surely be put to death* it is *holy unto the Lord*.” (See *Leviticus*, xxvii, 28-30.)

FOOTNOTES TO “THE SOLDIER’S DAUGHTER”

43

“Notwithstanding the numerous proofs that the Israelites worshipped a variety of gods, and even offered human sacrifices until a far later period than their Pagan neighbors, they have contrived to blind posterity in regard to truth. They sacrificed human life as late as 169 B.C.,* and the *Bible* contains a number of such records. At a time when the Pagans had long abandoned the abominable practice, and had replaced the sacrificial man by the animal, † Jephthah is represented sacrificing his own daughter to the “Lord” for a burnt-offering.” *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 524.

[. . . as we read in the Book of Judges that “Judah could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron.” (*Judges*, i, 19)] It is said in the “Holy Book,” that it was “the Lord [who] was with Judah,” who “could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron” (*Judges*, i, 19), and not “Judah” at all. This is but natural, according to popular belief and superstition that “the Devil is afraid of *iron*.” The strong connection and even identity between Jehovah and the Devil is ably insisted upon by the Rev. Haweis. See his *Key* (p. 22).

[But the more heroic and divine these persons were, the more demoniacal and diabolic must be the religion of those persons who required them thus to suffer] And yet it is this “demoniacal and diabolical religion” that passed part and parcel into Protestantism.

[. . . the priests and rulers of the church taught such a cruel religion] So “the people and priests” do now. And as the late Rev. Henry Ward Beecher once said in a sermon, “could Jesus come back and behave in the streets of Christian cities as he did in those of Jerusalem, he would be declared an impostor and then confined in prison.”

* Antiochus Epiphanes found in 169 B.C. in the Jewish temple, a man kept there to be sacrificed. *Vide* Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, Book II, viii, 90-96.

† The ox of Dionysus was sacrificed at the Bacchic Mysteries. See Charles Anthon, *A Classical Dictionary*, 1848, p. 1304.

[. . . when the Church is willing to allow . . . liberty in the pulpit for explaining the mystery and translating the truth of a “Crucified Christ,” then it will be seen that the truth . . . shall make us free.]

Only, as such *truth* and *freedom* amounts to the Church committing suicide and burying herself with her own hands, she will never allow such a thing. She will die her natural death the day when there will not exist a man, woman or child to believe any longer in her dogmas. And this beneficent result might be achieved within her own hierarchy, were there many such sincere, brave and honest clergymen who, like the writer of this article, fear not to speak the truth—whatever may come.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

February, 1888

TRAITÉ ÉLÉMENTAIRE DE SCIENCE OCCULTE

[REVIEW]

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 6, February, 1888, pp. 499-500]

[This is a review-article of a work by Papus (Gérard Analect V. Encausse), Paris, Georges Carré, 1888. While the authorship of this review is not absolutely certain, the authoritative manner in which it is written and the nature of the subject strongly suggest that it is from H.P.B.'s pen.]

This, the latest of the admirable publications now being issued by Monsieur Georges Carré, under the auspices of "L'Isis," the French branch of the Theosophical Society, deserves a hearty welcome at the hands of all students of Occultism, as it fulfils the promise of its title, which is high praise indeed.

The book is written and constructed on correct Occult principles; it contains seven chapters, three devoted to theory and four to the application and practical illustration of that theory.

After an eloquent introductory chapter, Monsieur Papus proceeds to lead his readers by easy transitions into the mysterious science of numbers. This—the first key to

TRAITÉ ÉLÉMENTAIRE DE SCIENCE OCCULTE

45

practical Occultism—is at once the simplest and the most subtle of sciences. Hitherto there has existed no really elementary exposition of its primary, fundamental principles. And, as this science of numbers lies at the base of every one of those applications of occult science which are still to any extent studied, a knowledge of it is almost indispensable.

Astrology, Chiromancy, Cartomancy, in short, all the arts of divination, rest ultimately on numbers and their occult powers, as a foundation.

And yet, though the students of each of these several arts must, perforce, acquire a certain knowledge of numerical science, yet very few of them possess that knowledge in a systematic and co-ordinated form.

Of course Monsieur Papus does not, and cannot, give anything like a complete textbook on the subject, but he does give, in clear language, the fundamental guiding principles of this science. Moreover, he illustrates the methods of numerical working, by numerous and well-chosen examples—an aid which is simply invaluable to the student who is making his first entrance into this field of study. In the third chapter these abstract formulæ are given as they relate to man, as an individual, and as a member of that larger whole, called humanity. This completes the purely theoretical portion of the book, and in

the fourth chapter we are shown how these general principles work in their application.

Signs and symbols are proved to be the *natural* expressions of ideas in accordance with fixed laws, and the method is applied by way of illustration to the interpretation of the Emerald Tablet of Hermes Trismegistus. The relation between number and form is shown as exhibited in geometrical figures, and Monsieur Papus gives a clue to a subject which has puzzled many—the actual *influence* in life of *names*. This chapter is most enthralling, but lack of space forbids any detailed comments, for so much would have to be said.

Chapters five and six are almost equally interesting; full of lucid illustration and valuable hints to the practical student, they form almost a manual in themselves. But

on one point Monsieur Papus is certainly in error, though, since it is on a matter of history, its importance is relatively small. He attaches *far* too much weight to the Jews and to their national system of occultism—the Kabbala. True, that system is the most familiar in Europe; but it has been so much overlaid by a semi-esoteric veil, and additions and interpolations by Christian Occultists, that its inner grossness is lost sight of; so that students are apt to be led away from the truth, and to form erroneous conceptions as to the value and meaning of many symbols, the importance of which in practical work is very great. What esoteric knowledge the Jews possessed, they derived either from the Egyptians or the Babylonians during the captivity. Hence Monsieur Saint-Ives d'Alveydre, his gigantic erudition notwithstanding, is altogether mistaken in the stress he lays on their knowledge, their place in history and their mission as a nation. This, however, is but a matter of small moment in a book, the practical value of which it would be difficult to over-estimate.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
February, 1888

WHAT OF PHENOMENA?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 6, February, 1888, pp. 504-506]

To the Editor of *Lucifer*.

I avail myself of your invitation to correspondents, in order to ask a question.

How is it that we hear nothing now of the signs and wonders with which Neo-theosophy was ushered in? Is the "age of miracles" past in the Society?

Yours respectfully,

*.

"Occult phenomena," is what our correspondent apparently refers to. They failed to produce the desired effect, but they were, in no sense of the word, "miracles." It was supposed that intelligent people, especially men of science, would, at least, have recognized the existence of a new and deeply interesting field of enquiry and research

WHAT OF PHENOMENA?

47

when they witnessed physical effects produced at will, for which they were not able to account. It was supposed that theologians would have welcomed the proof of which they stand so sadly in need in these agnostic days, that the soul and the spirit are not mere creations of their fancy, due to ignorance of the physical constitution of man, but entities quite as real as the body, and much more important. These expectations were not realized. The phenomena were misunderstood and misrepresented, both as regards their nature and their purpose.

In the light which experience has now thrown upon the matter, the explanation of this unfortunate circumstance is not far to seek. Neither science nor religion acknowledges the existence of the Occult, as the term is understood and employed in theosophy; in the sense, that is to say, of a super-material, but not super-natural, region, governed by law; nor do they recognize the existence of latent powers and possibilities in man. Any interference with the everyday routine of the material world is attributed, by religion, to the arbitrary will of a good or an evil autocrat inhabiting a supernatural region inaccessible to man and subject to no law, either in his actions or constitution, and for a knowledge of whose ideas and wishes mortals are entirely dependent upon inspired communications delivered through an accredited messenger. The power of working so-called miracles has always been deemed the proper and sufficient credentials of a messenger from heaven, and the mental habit of regarding any occult power in that light is still so strong that any exercise

of that power is supposed to be “miraculous,” or to claim to be so. It is needless to say that this way of regarding extraordinary occurrences is in direct opposition to the scientific spirit of the age, nor is it the position practically occupied by the more intelligent portion of mankind at present. When people see wonders, nowadays, the sentiment excited in their minds is no longer veneration and awe, but curiosity.

It was in the hope of arousing and utilizing this spirit of curiosity that occult phenomena were shown. It was believed that this manipulation of forces of nature which

lie below the surface—that surface of things which modern science scratches and pecks at so industriously and so proudly—would have led to enquiry into the nature and the laws of those forces, unknown to science, but perfectly known to occultism. That the phenomena did excite curiosity in the minds of those who witnessed them, is certainly true, but it was, unfortunately, for the most part, of an idle kind. The greater number of the witnesses developed an insatiable appetite for phenomena for their own sake, without any thought of studying the philosophy or the science of whose truth and power the phenomena were merely trivial and, so to say, accidental illustrations. In but a few cases the curiosity which was awakened gave birth to the serious desire to study the philosophy and the science themselves and for their own sake.

Experience has taught the leaders of the movement that the vast majority of professing Christians are absolutely precluded by their mental condition and attitude—the result of centuries of superstitious teaching—from calmly examining the phenomena in their aspect of natural occurrences governed by law. The Roman Catholic Church, true to its traditions, excuses itself from the examination of any occult phenomena on the plea that they are necessarily the work of the Devil, whenever they occur outside of its own pale, since it has a lawful monopoly of the legitimate miracle business. The Protestant Church denies the personal intervention of the Evil One on the material plane; but, never having gone into the miracle business itself, it is apparently a little doubtful whether it would know a *bona-fide* miracle if it saw one, but, being just as unable as its elder sister to conceive the extension of the reign of law beyond the limits of matter and force as known to us in our present state of consciousness, it excuses itself from the study of occult phenomena on the plea that they lie within the province of science rather than of religion.

Now science has its miracles as well as the Church of Rome. But, as it is altogether dependent upon its instrument-maker for the production of these miracles, and, as

it claims to be in possession of the last known word in regard to the laws of nature, it was

hardly to be expected that it would take very kindly to “miracles,” in whose production apparatus has no part and which claim to be instances of the operation of forces and laws of which it has no knowledge. Modern science, moreover, labours under disabilities with respect to the investigation of the Occult quite as embarrassing as those of Religion; for, while Religion cannot grasp the idea of natural law as applied to the supersensuous Universe, Science does not allow the existence of any supersensuous universe at all to which the reign of law could be extended; nor can it conceive the possibility of any other state of consciousness than our present terrestrial one. It was, therefore, hardly to be expected that science would undertake the task it was called upon to perform with much earnestness and enthusiasm; and, indeed, it seems to have felt that it was not expected to treat the phenomena of occultism less cavalierly than it had treated divine miracles. So it calmly proceeded at once to pooh-pooh the phenomena; and when obliged to express some kind of opinion, it did not hesitate, without examination, and on hearsay reports, to attribute them to fraudulent contrivances—wires, trap-doors, and so forth.

It was bad enough for the leaders of the movement when they endeavoured to call the attention of the world to the great and unknown field for scientific and religious enquiry which lies on the borderland between matter and spirit, to find themselves set down as agents of his Satanic Majesty, or as superior adepts in the charlatan line; but the unkindest cut of all, perhaps, came from a class of people whose own experiences, rightly understood, ought certainly to have taught them better: the occult phenomena were claimed by the Spiritualists as the work of their dear departed ones, but the leaders in Theosophy were declared to be somewhat less even than mediums in disguise.

Never were the phenomena presented in any other character than that of instances of a power *over perfectly natural though unrecognized forces*, and incidentally over

matter, possessed by certain individuals who have attained to a larger and higher knowledge of the Universe than has been reached by scientists and theologians, or can ever be reached by them, by the roads they are now respectively pursuing. Yet this power is latent in all men, and could, in time, be wielded by anyone who would cultivate the knowledge and conform to the conditions necessary for its development. Nevertheless, except in a few isolated and honourable instances, never was it received in any other character than as would-be miracles, or as works of the Devil, or as vulgar tricks, or as amusing gape-seed, or as the performances of those dangerous “spooks” that masquerade in séance rooms, and feed on the vital energies of mediums and sitters. And, from all sides, theosophy and theosophists were attacked with a rancour and bitterness, with an absolute disregard alike of fact and logic, and with malice, hatred and uncharitableness that would be utterly inconceivable, did not religious history teach us what mean and unreasoning animals ignorant men become when their cherished prejudices are touched; and did not the history of scientific research teach us, in its turn, how very like an ignorant man a learned man can behave when the truth of his theories is called in question.

An occultist can produce phenomena, but he cannot supply the world with brains, nor with the intelligence and good faith necessary to understand and appreciate them. Therefore, it is hardly to be wondered at, that *word* came to abandon phenomena and let the ideas of Theosophy stand on their own intrinsic merits.

***Collected Writings* VOLUME IX**
February, 1888

CORRESPONDECE

51

CORRESPONDENCE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 6, February, 1888, pp. 507-512]

The editors have received the two following letters—one from the learned Founder of Hylo-Idealism, the other from a gentleman, a casual correspondent, of whom they know *absolutely nothing* except his most extraordinary way of expressing his thoughts in words and terms hitherto unheard by ordinary mortals. Both take the editors to task for using their undeniable right of criticism and editorial judgment. As *Lucifer*, however, is a magazine *sui generis*, and as its policy is the greatest possible tolerance and fairness to all parties concerned, it will abstain from its legal prerogative of leaving the letters without reply or notice. *Lucifer* hands them over, therefore, to the “ADVERSARY,” to be dealt with according to their respective merits. The editors have never pretended to an “understanding of Hylo-Idealism” nor do they entertain any such rash hope for the future. They belong to that humble class of mortals who labour to their dying day under the belief that $2 \times 2 = 4$, and can by no means, even hylo-idealistic, make 5. “C. N.”’s letter placed the new “philosophy” in an entirely different light; firstly, because it is written in good English, and because the style of the writer is extremely attractive; and secondly, because at least one point has now been made clear to the editors: “Hylo-Idealism” is, like modern spiritualism, the *essence of transcendental materialism*. If in Mr. Huxley’s opinion Comte’s Positivism is, in practice, “Catholicism *minus* Christianity,” in the views of the editors of *Lucifer* Hylo-Idealism is “Metaphysics *minus* psychology and—*physics*.” Let its apostles explain away its flagrant contradictions, and then *Lucifer* will be the first to render justice to it as a philosophy. Meanwhile, it can only acknowledge a number of remarkably profound thoughts that are to be found scattered in independent solitude throughout the letters of Dr. Lewins (*Humanism versus Theism*) and others, and—no more.

52

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

RE HYLO-IDEALISM

To the Editors of *Lucifer*.

Perhaps space may be found in the February or other early issue of your interesting and suggestive serial for the present curt communication. In a footnote of your January number I am coupled with Mr. H. Spencer as being more Atheist than Moleschott and Büchner—to say nothing of such compromising and irresolute scientists as Darwin, Huxley, and Co. Now, that atheistic or non-animist standpoint is the pivot on which my whole synthesis revolves; and is, I contend, the burning problem at this epoch—ethical and intellectual—of the human mind—*thoroughly* to establish on certain concrete, rational and scientific *data*, that is to say—not on the Utopias of Speculation and Metaphysics. My principle is exactly that of Kant (inter alia) when he formulates the “Thing in Itself.” But we have only to study the short and handy *A Critique of Kant*, referred to in your columns—by Kuno Fischer, translated by Dr. Hough, to see how fast and loose that “all-shattering” metaphysician played with his all-destructive theme. Not only does he entirely reverse it and its corollaries in his critique of the “Practical Reason,” and of “Judgment,” but also in the second edition of the *Critique of Pure Reason* itself, in which originally, as its corollary, or rather concomitant, he, like myself, only on less sure premises, disposes of God, the Soul (Anima or Vital Principle), and Immortality—that is of another “personal” life after death. I hold with Lucretius, Epicurus, and others in ancient and modern times, of whom Shelley is a typical case, that no greater benefit can be bestowed on humanity than the elimination from sane thought of this ghastly and maddening Triune Spectre. God alone is quite “l’infâme” Voltaire dubs the Catholic Church. Looking through Nature “red in tooth and claws” to its *pseudo*-Author, we must expect to find a *Pandemon*. For any omnipotent Being who, unconditioned and unfettered in all respects, “willed” such a world of pain and anguish for sentient creatures, must be a Demon *worse* than mythology has fabled of Satan, Moloch, Mammon, or other fiends. It must be noted that in the classic Pantheon, the Fates, or Fatal Sisters, are “above” all the Immortals of Olympus, including Jove himself—a saving provision quite inadmissible in modern Monotheism, which endows its Divinity * with absolute omnipotence and fore-knowledge.

ROBERT LEWINS, M.D.

* Deuce, *i.e.*, Devil, is the synonym of *Deus*.

CORRESPONDENCE

53

HYLO-IDEALISM

To the Editors of *Lucifer*.

I have to thank you for your kind insertion of my note on above in January issue of the Magazine.

I have not the slightest desire to quarrel with your prefaced comments on my style of writing. It seems to you to be “turgid,” and you take advantage of some unkind epithets lately dealt out to Theosophy in the *Secular Review* to return the compliment to me with interest added. Be it so. It would seem but fair to, let me say, compliment those, and those only, who have directly complimented you; but I have no wish, as I have just said, to find fault with *any* comment on Hylo-Idealism or on the methods of its advocacy. *All* criticism is, I know, received by the excogitator of the system with thanks, and, save that both he and I think your note *re* “*Theobroma*” not a little at fault (for explanation I refer you to the well-known Messrs. Epps), I can say the same for myself.

I can see, however, in spite of the raillery with which you honour us, that a right understanding of Hylo-Idealism—I beg pardon, *High-Low* Idealism—is still very far from being yours. Why, in a recent issue of *Lucifer*, the old difficulty of, as I call it, the “Coincident assumption of Materiality” is started as if it had never before been thought of. It is, in point of fact, fully dealt with in my “Appendix” to the *Auto-Centricism* pamphlet, which has already passed under your review! It is not worth while to enter once more upon this point; suffice it then to say, in addition, that I explained it also, at full length, to a Theosophical writer—Mr. E. D. Fawcett *—in the *Secular Review*, some months ago. He had started the same venerable objection, but

after my reply, he so far honoured me as not to return to the charge. Let him do so now, and then a Theosophical attack and a Hylo-Ideal defence will be before you. But, really, it is no argument against my position to extract some half-dozen lines of my writing from a contemporary and to follow this *souçon* with three printer's "shrieks."

I shall wait with interest the promised letter from "C. N.," placing Hylo-Idealism in a "new and very different light," as you say. This is something quite new. Dr. Lewins, C. N., and I have, none of us, been able, hitherto, to find any material difference between our several presentations of the system.

I have the honour to be, Mesdames,
Your most obedient servant,

G. M. McC.

* [Vide the Bio-Bibliographical Index for information regarding him.—*Compiler.*]

TO DR. LEWINS, AND THE HYLO-IDEALISTS AT LARGE

The several learned gentlemen of the above persuasion, who have honoured *Lucifer* with their letters and articles, will please to accept the present as a collective Reply. Life is too short to indulge very often in such lengthy explanations. But "une fois n'est pas coutume."

In "coupling" Dr. Lewins' name with those he mentions—especially with Mr. Herbert Spencer's—the Editors had assuredly no intention of saying anything derogatory to the dignity of the founder of Hylo-Idealism. They have called the latter system—its qualification of *Idealistic* notwithstanding—"atheistical," and to this Dr. Lewins himself does not demur. Quite the contrary. If his protest (against a casual remark made in a footnote of two lines!) means anything at all, it means that he feels hurt to find his name associated with the names of such "compromising and [in *atheism*] irresolute scientists as Darwin, Huxley, and Co." What is it that our erudite correspondent demurs to, then? Just that, and nothing more. His prefixed adjectives refer to the half-heartedness of these gentlemen in the matter of atheism and materialism, not surely, to their scientific achievements. Indeed, these illustrious naturalists are timid enough to leave half-opened doors in their speculations for something to enter in which is not quite matter, and yet what it is they do not, or *do not wish* to know.

Indeed, they derive man, his origin and consciousness, *only* from the lower forms of animal creation and the brutes, instead of attributing life, mind and intellect—as the followers of the new System do—simply to the pranks played by *Prakriti* (the great Ignorance and Illusion) on our "diseased nervous centres"—*abstract thought* being synonymous with *Neuropathy* in the teachings of the Hylo-Idealists (see *Auto-Centricism*, p. 40). But all this has been already said and *better said* by Kapila, in his Sankhya, and is very old philosophy indeed; so that Messrs. Darwin and Co. have been, perhaps, wise in their generation to adopt another theory. Our great Darwinists are practical men, and avoid

the same time, as the hare in such case would be sure to run away, and the eagle to be lost in the clouds. They prefer to ignore the ideas and conceptions of the Universe, as held by such “loose,” and—as philosophically expressed by our *uncompromising* opponent—“all-shattering metaphysicians” as Kant was. Therefore letting all such “metaphysical crack-brained theories” severely alone, they made man and his thinking *Ego* the lineal descendant of the revered ancestor of the now tailless baboon, our beloved and esteemed first cousin. This is only logical *from the Darwinian standpoint*. What is, then, Dr. Lewins’ quarrel with these great men, or with us? They have their theory, the inventor of Hylo-Idealism has his theory, we, Metaphysicians, have our ideas and theories; and, the *Moon* shining with impartial and equal light on the respective occiputs of Hylo-Idealists, Animalists, and Metaphysicians, she pours material enough for every one concerned to allow each of them to “live and let live.” No man can be at once a Materialist and an Idealist, and remain consistent. Eastern philosophy and occultism are based on the *absolute unity* of the Root Substance, and they recognise only one infinite and universal CAUSE. The Occultists are UNITARIANS *par excellence*. But there is such a thing as conventional, time-honoured terms with one and the same meaning attached to them all—at any rate on this plane of illusion. And if we want to understand each other, we are forced to use such terms in their generally-accepted sense, and avoid calling mind matter, and *vice versa*. The definition of a *materialised “Spirit”* as frozen whiskey is in its place in a humouristic pun: it becomes an absurdity in philosophy. It is Dr. Lewins’ argument that “the very first principle of logic is, that two ‘causes’ are not to be thought of when one is sufficient”; and though the first and the ultimate, the Alpha and the Omega in the existence of the Universe, is one absolute cause, yet, on the plane of manifestations and differentiations, matter, as phenomenon, and Spirit as noumenon, cannot be so loosely confused as to merge the latter into the former, under the pretext that one self-evident natural cause (however secondary in the sight

of logic and reason) is “sufficient for our purpose,” and we need not “transcend the proper conditions of thought” and fall back upon the lower level of “lawless and uncertain fancy”—*i.e.*, metaphysics. (*Vide Humanism versus Theism*, pp. 14-15.)

We have nothing whatever, I say it again, against “Hylo-Idealism” with the exception of its compound and self-contradictory name. Nor do we oppose Dr. Lewins’ earlier thoughts, as embodied in “C. N.’s” *Humanism versus Theism*. That which we permit

ourselves to object to and oppose is the later system grown into a *Bifrontian*, Janus-like monster, a hybrid *duality* notwithstanding its forced mask of Unity. Surely it is not because Dr. Lewins calls “Spirit—a *fiction*,” and attributes Mind, Thought, Genius, Intellect, and all the highest attributes of thinking man to simple effects or functions of Hylo-zoism, that the greatest problem of psychology, *the relation of mind to matter*, is solved? No one can accuse “The Adversary” of too much tenderness or even regard for the conclusions of such rank materialists as the Darwinians generally are. But surely no impartial man would attribute their constant failure to explain the relations of mind to matter, and the confessions of their ignorance of the ultimate constitution of that matter itself, to timidity and irresoluteness, but rather to the right cause: *i.e.*, the *absolute impossibility of explaining spiritual effects by physical causes*, in the first case; and the presence of that in matter which baffles and mocks the efforts of the physical senses to perceive or feel, and therefore to explain it, in the second case. It is not, evidently, a desire to *compromise* that forced Mr. Huxley to confess that “in strictness we [the Scientists] know nothing about the composition of matter,” but the *honesty* of a man of science in not speculating upon what he did not believe in, and knew nothing about. Does J. Le Conte insult the majesty of physical science by declaring that the creation or destruction, increase or diminution of matter, “*lies beyond the domain of science?*” * And to whose prejudices does

* *Correlation of Vital with Chemical and Physical Forces*. Appendix.

Mr. Tyndall pander, he, who once upon a time shocked the whole world of believers in spiritual existence, by declaring in his Belfast address that in matter alone was “the promise and potency of every form and quality of life” (just what Dr. Lewins does) * when he maintains that “the passage *from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of CONSCIOUSNESS is unthinkable*,” and adds:

Granted that a definite thought and a molecular action in the brain occur simultaneously; we do not possess the intellectual organ nor apparently any rudiments of the organ, which would enable us to pass by a process of reasoning from one to the other. They appear together, but *we do not know why*. Were our minds and senses so expanded, strengthened and illuminated, as to enable us to see and feel the very molecules of the brain; were we capable of following all their motions, all their groupings, all their electric discharges, if such there be; and were we intimately acquainted with the corresponding states of thought and feeling, we should be as far as ever from the solution of the problems. “How are these physical processes connected with the facts of consciousness?” The chasm between the two classes of phenomena would still remain intellectually impassable. †

To our surprise, however, we find that our learned correspondent—Tyndall, Huxley & Co., notwithstanding—*has* passed the *intellectually impassable* chasm by modes of

* [To alter Tyndall's words, as quoted by H. P. B., would only confuse the sentence and obscure the argument. So we have left them unaltered. However, the actual words of Tyndall in his "Belfast Address" delivered in 1874 (*Vide his Fragments of Science*, 5th ed., New York, D. Appleton, 1884, p. 524) are somewhat different, and run as follows:

" . . . Believing as I do, in the continuity of nature, I cannot stop abruptly where our microscopes cease to be of use. Here the vision of the mind authoritatively supplements the vision of the eye. By an intellectual necessity I cross the boundary of the experimental evidence, and discern in that Matter which we, in our ignorance of its latent powers, and notwithstanding our professed reverence of its Creator, have hitherto covered with opprobrium, the promise and potency of all terrestrial life."

—*Compiler.*]

† John Tyndall, *Scientific Addresses*, New Haven, Conn., 1871: "On the Methods and Tendencies of Physical Investigation," pp. 16-17.

perception, "anti-intellectual," so to speak. I say this in no impertinent mood; but merely following Dr. Lewins on his own lines of thought. As his expressions seem absolutely antiphrastic in meaning to those generally accepted by the common herd, "anti-intellectual" would mean with the Hylo-Idealists "anti-spiritual" (spirit being a *fiction* with them). Thus their Founder must have crossed the impassable chasm—say, by a hylo-zoistic process of perception, "starting from the region of rational cogitation" and not from "that lower level of lawless and uncertain fancy," as Theosophists, Mystics, and other *hoi polloi* of thought, do. He has done it to his own "mental satisfaction," and this is all a Hylo-Idealist will ever aspire to, as Dr. Lewins himself tells us. He "cannot deny that there may be *behind* [?] nature a 'cause of causes,' * but if so, it is a god who hides himself, or itself, from mortal thought. Nature is at all events vice-regent plenipotentiary, and with *her* thought has alone to deal." Just so, and we say it too, for reasons given in the footnote. "There is a natural solution for everything," he adds "Of course, if there be no 'cause,' this solution is the arrangement and co-ordination of invariable sequences in our own minds rather than an 'explanation' or 'accounting for' phenomena. Properly speaking we can 'account for' nothing. *Mental satisfaction*—unity between microcosm and macrocosm, not the search after 'First Causes' . . . *is the true chief end of man.*" (*Humanism versus Theism*, p. 15.)

This seems the backbone of Hylo-Idealistic philosophy, which thus appears as a cross breed between Epicurianism and the "Illusionism" of the Buddhist Yogachâryas. This stands proven by the contradictions of his system. Dr. Lewins seems to have achieved that to do which every mortal scientist has hitherto failed firstly, by declaring (in *Human. vs. Theism*, p. 17) the

* We Theosophists, who do not *limit* nature, do not see the "cause of causes" or the *unknowable* deity *behind* that which is limitless, but identify that abstract Nature with the deity itself, and explain its visible

whole objective world—“*phenomenal or ideal*,” * and “everything in it *spectral*” (*Auto-Centricism*, p. 9), and yet *admitting the reality of matter*. More than this. In the teeth of all the scientific luminaries, from Faraday to Huxley, who all confess to knowing NOTHING of matter, he declares that———”Matter, organic or inorganic . . . *is now fully known*” (*Auto-Centricism*, p. 40)!!

I humbly beg Dr. Lewins’ pardon for the rude question; but does he really mean to say what he does say? Does he want his readers to believe that up to his appearance in this world of matter, thinking men did not know what they were talking about, and that among all the “Ego Brains” of this globe his brain is the one omniscient *reality*, while all others are empty phantasms, or *spectral* balloons? Besides which, matter cannot surely be *real* and *unreal* at the same time. If *unreal*—and he maintains it—then all Science can know about it is that it knows *nothing*, and this is precisely what Science confesses. And if *real*—and Dr. Lewins, as shown, declares it likewise—then his *Idealism* goes upside down, and *Hylo* alone remains to mock him and his philosophy. These may be trifling considerations in the consciousness of an *Ego* of Dr. Lewins’ power, but they are very serious contradictions, and also impediments in the way of such humble thinkers as Vedantins, Logicians, and Theosophists, toward recognising, let alone appreciating, “Hylo-Idealism.” Our learned correspondent pooh-poohs Metaphysics, and at the same time not only travels on purely metaphysical grounds, but adopts and sets forth the most metaphysical tenets, the very gist of the PARA-metaphysical Vedanta philosophy, tenets held also by the Buddhist “Illusionists” —the *Yogachâryas* and *Madhyamikas*. Both schools maintain that all is void (*sarva* □ *ûnya*), or that which Dr. Lewins calls spectral and phantasmal. Except internal sensation or intelligence (*viññâna*) the *Yogachâryas* regard everything else as illusion. Nothing that is material can have any but a *spectral* existence with them. So far, our “Bauddhas” are at one with *the Hylo-Idealists*, but they part at

* We call the *noumenal*—the “ideal.”

the crucial moment. The New School teaches that the Brain (the originator of consciousness) is the only factor and Creator of the visible Universe; that in *it* alone all our ideas of external things are born, and that, apart from it, nothing has real existence,

everything being illusion. Now what has that Brain, or rather the material its particles and cells are composed of, distinct in it from other matter that it should be rendered such honours? *Physically*, it differs very little indeed from the brain stuff and cranium of any anthropoid ape. Unless we divorce consciousness, or the EGO, from matter, one materialistic philosophy is as good as the other, and none is worth living for. What his Brain-Ego is, Dr. Lewins does not show anywhere. He urges that his “atheistic or *non-animist* (soulless) standpoint is the *pivot*” on which his “whole synthesis revolves.” But as that “pivot” is no higher than the physical brain with its hallucinations, then it must be a broken reed indeed. A philosophy that goes no further than superficial Agnosticism, and says that “what Tennyson says of Deity *may* be true, but it is not in the region of natural cogitation; for it transcends the logical *Encheiresis naturae*” (*Human. vs. Theism*)—is no philosophy, but simply *unqualified negation*. And one who teaches that “*savants*, or specialists, are the last to reach the *summa scientiae*, for the constant *search* after knowledge must ever prevent its *fruition*” (*ibid.*), cuts the ground himself under his feet, and thus loses the right. not only to be considered a man of science, but likewise his claim to the title of philosopher, for he rejects all knowledge. Dr. Lewins, quoting Schiller, to the effect that truth can never be reached while the mind is in its analytic throes, shows the poet-philosopher saying that:—“To capture the fleeting phantom he (the analyst) must fetter it by rules, must anatomise its fair body into concepts, and imprison *its living spirit* into a bare skeleton of words”—and thus brings this as a prop and proof of his own arguments that we need not trouble ourselves with the “cause of causes.” But Schiller believed in spirit and immortality, while the Hylo-Idealists deny them *in toto*. What he says above is accepted by every Occultist and

***Collected Writings* VOLUME IX**
February, 1888

CORRESPONDENCE

61

Theosophist, simply because *he refers to the purely intellectual* (not Spiritual) *analysis* on the physical plane, and according to the present scientific methods. Such analysis, of course, will never help man to reach the real *inner* soul-knowledge, but must ever leave him stranded in the bogs of fruitless speculation.

The truth is, that Hylo-Idealism is at best QUIETISM— only on the purely material plane. “Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die,” seems its motto. Dr. Lewins tells us that he holds his views with Epicurus. I beg leave to contradict again. Epicurus insisted upon the necessity of making away with an unphilosophical, anthropomorphic deity—a bundle of contradictions—and so do we, the Theosophists. But Epicurus believed in gods, finite and conditioned in space and time, still *divine* when compared to objective ephemeral man: again, just as we, Theosophists, believe in them.

We feel sorry to have to say unpleasant truths. The Founder of Hylo-Idealism is evidently a marvellously well-read man, his learning is great and undeniable; and, we have always had an instinctive respect for, and sympathy with, thinkers of his calibre. But, we have been sent pamphlets and books on Hylo-Idealism for review, and one would be truant to his duty to conceal one’s honest and sincere views on anything. Therefore, we say that, contradictions and inconsistencies in the Hylo-Idealistic system apart, we find in it a mass of ideas and *arguments* which come forcibly home to us, because they are part and parcel of the Eastern Idealism. Our premises and propositions seem to be almost identical in some respects, but the conclusions we come to disagree in every point, the most important of which is the true nature of matter. This, which “has been *fabled* as ‘Spirit,’ ” writes Dr. Lewins in 1878, “is really merely the ‘*vis insita*’ of matter or ‘nature’—the latter a misnomer if creation or birth is a delusion, as it must be on the hypothesis of the eternity of matter.”

Here the Doctor speaks evidently of “Spirit” from the Christian stand-point, and criticises it from this aspect. And from this stand-point and aspect he is perfectly right;

62

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

but as wrong from those of Eastern philosophy. Did he but view Spirit, *as one with eternal matter*, which, though eternal *in esse* is but finite and conditioned during its periodical manifestations, he would not so materialise its *vis insita*—which is *vis vitae* but when applied to individual manifestations, the living subjects of illusion, or animated bodies. But this would lead us too far, and we must close the subject with one more protest. There

is a casual remark in *Humanism versus Theism* to the effect (on the authority of Ueberweg) that “the early Greek thinkers and Sages were Hylo-Zoists.” Aye, learned Doctor; but the early Greek thinkers understood Hylo-Zoism (from “Hyle” *primordial* matter, or what the greatest chemist in England, Mr. Crookes, has called “protyle,” *undifferentiated matter*, and “Zoe,” life) in a way very different from yours. So are we, Theosophists and Eastern Occultists, “Hylo-Zoists”; but it is because with us “life” is the synonym both of Spirit and Matter, or the ONE eternal and infinite LIFE whether manifested or otherwise. That LIFE is both the eternal IDEA and its periodical LOGOS. He who has grasped and mastered this doctrine completely has thereby solved the mystery of BEING.

“THE ADVERSARY”.

P.S.—We have in type a very excellent article by Mr. L. Courtney, which could not find room in this present number, but will appear in March. In it, the writer says all that he *can* possibly say in favour of Hylo-Idealism, and that is all one can do. Thus, *Lucifer* will give one fair chance more to the new System; after which it will have gained a certain right to neither answer at such length, nor accept any article on Hylo-Idealism that will go beyond a page or so.—“A.”

Collected Writings VOLUME IX
February, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

63

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 6, February, 1888, pp. 472, 482-83]

Aanru is the celestial field where the defunct's soul received wheat and corn, growing therein *seven cubits high* (See *Book of the Dead*, 124 *et seq.*) *

Amrita (immortal) applied to the Soma juice, and called the "Water of Life."

["Though . . . the sun-souls attract the earth-souls, the lost ones, for a while, to bring them up to themselves by the path that leads to Nirvana. . ."] This is a doctrine of the Visishtadwaita sect of the Vedantins. The *Jiva* (spiritual life principle, the living *Monad*) of one who attained Moksha or Nirvana, "breaks through the Brahmarandhra and goes to *Suryamandala* (the region of the sun) through the Solar rays. Then it goes, through a dark spot in the Sun, to Paramapada" to which it is directed by the Supreme Wisdom acquired by *Yoga*, and helped thereinto by the *Devas* (gods) called Archis, the "Flames," or Fiery Angels, answering to the Christian archangels. †

* [Chap. CIX, 7-8, and Chap. CXLIX, text of second Vignette in E.A.W. Budge's translation of the Theban Recension.—*Compiler*.]

† [In *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 132, H. P. B. quotes at greater length from the *Vīśishtādwaita Catechism* of Pandit N. Bhāshyāchārya, F.T.S. It is apparently a more complete text of the quotation as given in the above editorial comment, and runs thus:

"The Jiva (Soul) goes with Sukshma Sarira from the heart of the body, to the Brahmarandhra in the crown of the head, traversing Sushumna, a nerve connecting the heart with the Brahmarandhra. The Jiva breaks through the Brahmarandhra and goes to the region of the Sun (*Suryamandala*) through the solar Rays. Then it goes, through a dark spot in the Sun, to Paramapada. The Jiva is directed on its way by the Supreme Wisdom acquired by *Yoga*. The Jiva thus proceeds to Paramapada by the aid of Athivahikas (bearers in transit), known by the names of Archi-Ahas . . . Adityas, Prajapati, etc. The Archis here mentioned are certain pure Souls, etc., etc."

H. P. B. defines in a footnote the *Sukshma-āra* as being the " 'dream-like' illusive body, with which are clothed the inferior Dhyanis of the celestial Hierarchy."—*Compiler*.]

[We have now discovered a triangular key—light, music, form—which will disclose to us the exact relations which colour sustains to the interlaced triangles, the six-rayed star,

universal symbol of creative force acting upon matter] Hence in Kabalistic symbolism the *pentacle*, or the six-pointed star, is the sign of the *manifested* “Logos,” or the “Heavenly man,” the Tetragrammaton. “The four-lettered Adni (*Adonai*, ‘the Lord’), is the *Eheieh* (the symbol of *life* or existence), is the Lord of the six limbs (6 Sephiroth) and his Bride (*Malkuth*, or physical nature, also Earth) is his seventh limb.” (*Chaldean Book of Numbers*, viii, 3-4.)

[The culmination of light resides in the yellow ray, and hence to that colour is given the East point in our symbolised centre of radiation] It is the secret of the great reverence shown in the East for this colour. It is the colour of the *Yogi* dress in India, and of the *Gelugpa* sect (“Yellow caps”) in Thibet. It symbolizes *pure blood* and sunlight, and is called “the stream of life.” Red, as its opposite, is the colour of the *Dugpas*, and black magicians.

“TWILIGHT VISIONS”

[*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 6, February, 1888, pp. 463-65]

[The following footnote and closing Editorial Note are appended by H. P. B. to the second instalment of a mystical poem by Wm. C. Eldon Serjeant, entitled “Twilight Visions.” The writer’s verse: “O, woman, clothed with the Bridegroom’s Power” elicited the following comment from H. P. B.:]

In the Kabala, the Bride of the “Heavenly Man,” *Tetragrammaton*, is *Malkuth*—the foundation or kingdom. It is our earth, which, when *regenerated* and purified (as matter), will be united to her bridegroom (Spirit). But in Esotericism there are two aspects of the LOGOS, or the “Father-Son,” which latter becomes his own father; one is the UNMANIFESTED Eternal, the other the manifested and periodical LOGOS. The “Bride” of the former is the universe as nature in the abstract. She is also his “MOTHER”;



WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE
April 13, 1851—March 21, 1896

Photograph originally published in *The Word*, New York,
Vol. XV, April, 1912.

“TWILIGHT VISIONS”

65

who, “clothed with the bridegroom’s power,” gives birth to the manifested universe (the second *logos*) through her own inherent, mystic power, and is, therefore, the Immaculate Mother; “the woman clothed with the sun, and travailing” in child birth, in *Revelation*, ch. xii.

This second part of the three which form the bulk of the poem called “Twilight Visions” by their author—from a purely Kabalistic standpoint of universal symbolical Esotericism, is most suggestive. Its literary value is apparent. But literary form in occultism counts for nothing in such mystic writing if its spirit is sectarian—if the symbolism fails in universal application or lacks correctness. In this, Part II, however (of the third to come we can yet say nothing), the Christian-Judaeian names may be altered and replaced by their Sanskrit or Egyptian equivalents, and the ideas will remain the same. It seems written in the universal “mystery-language,” and may be readily understood by an occultist, of whatever school or nationality. Nor will any true mystic, versed in that international tongue, whose origin is lost in the dark night of prehistoric ages, fail to recognise a true Brother, who has adopted the phraseology of the Initiates of the ancient Judaeian Tannaim—Daniel and St. John of the *Apocalypse*—and partially that of the

Christian Gnostics, only to be the more readily understood by the profane of Christian lands. Yet the author means precisely the same thing that would be in the mind of any Brahminical or Buddhist Initiate who, while deploring the present degenerated state of things, would place all his hope in the transient character of even the *Kali Yuga*, and trust in the speedy coming of the Kalki Avatar. We say again, the divine Science and Wisdom—*Theosophia*—is universal and common property, and the same under every sky. It is the physical type and the outward appearance in the dress, that make of one individual a Chinaman and of another a European, and of a third a red-skinned American. The inner man is one and all are “Sons of God” by birth-right.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

March, 1888

66

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

SUNDAY DEVOTION TO PLEASURE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 7, March, 1888, pp. 1-5]

The following is an extract from the *Daily Telegraph* of March 1st, and may speak for itself:—

At yesterday's sitting of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, the Archbishop presiding, the Bishop of Exeter laid on the table a petition which sets forth:—"That there has been of late a very marked increase in the employment of the afternoon and evening of the Lord's Day in amusements of various kinds by the upper and fashionable classes of Society. That the Society papers (so-called) in particular, and occasionally the daily papers on Monday, give more or less full accounts of entertainments which have taken place. Those of recent date include formal dinner-parties, smoking concerts, theatrical and semi-theatrical performances, comic recitations, and amusing programmes of fun and frolic, exhibitions of jugglery, Sunday parade in Hyde Park, coach drives of clubs, the drags assembling at Hampton Court, Richmond, and other places of resort, the 'Sunday up the river,' boxing at the Pelican Club, lawn tennis, dances at clubs and private houses, exhibitions (once at least) of the Wild West Show, and Show Sunday in the studios of artists. Some of these are novelties in the way of Lord's Day profanation. That the long lists of those present at these Sunday amusements, which are given in the Society papers, embrace men of eminence in art, science, politics and commerce, as well as mere *dilettanti*, and of men and women whose prominence is only that of devotion to pleasure. That many of these amusements are public, that their prevalence testifies to very loose Sunday habits on the part of the rich, and great, and noble of the land. Such abuses of the Lord's Day evidence an insatiable desire for distraction and dissipation, a very low regard for the claims of the Word of God, and the determination to put away the restraints of religion." The petitioners, who numbered 104, asked counsel on the subject, and suggested a protest against Sunday excursion trains, and a remonstrance against Sunday amusements and entertainments. The signatories included members of both Houses of Parliament, clergymen, and others. A discussion which arose on the question was adjourned till to-morrow, it being considered that the Bishop of London, who was absent yesterday, should be present, since it was in his diocese that the alleged Sunday desecration had been committed.

The debate was resumed on the following Friday, when the Bishop of London was present. His Lordship at once addressed the House, and declared his conviction that the state of affairs was not very much exaggerated. But as

SUNDAY DEVOTION TO PLEASURE

67

regards the especial prevalence in his diocese of this "desecration," he was of opinion that it was a consequence of the gathering together in London, during "the Season," of people

who carried similar practices into effect while in the country, and that greater attention was attracted to them by “the so-called Society papers.” His Lordship regarded the “pursuit of pleasure” on Sunday as much less excusable in the upper classes than in the lower, “where there is unremitting toil through the week, and where the other aspect of Sunday—namely, that it is a day of rest from toil—must necessarily take up a very much larger space in their thoughts than the character of it as a day of worship.” His Lordship was rather doubtful as to the efficacy of the protest, wisely considering that “protests of this kind, if they are allowed to be issued and fall flat, are likely to do rather more harm than good.”

The Bishop of Exeter—the spokesman of the petitioners—followed with a long extract from the pages of *The Bat*, a paper which, by the way, is now defunct. He considered that a simple statement that the Upper House had had its attention called to the state of affairs, and that it was of opinion that it “was derogatory to the spiritual and moral health of all ranks of the people of this country,” would “satisfy those who are anxious for the maintenance of the Lord’s Day.”

The Bishop of Winchester made remarks on the difference between the Sabbaths of the Jews and Christians and agreed with the dictum that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. Further, he said that the relaxation of the strict Sabbath rule was, to some extent, justified by the New Testament. He also asserted that “the only form of civil government ever distinctly ordained by God was the government of the Jewish people, and that in this He ordained that the labours of the year should not be continuous, but that there should be one day’s rest in seven for every man.” The Bishop said that the memorial referred almost entirely to the Upper Classes, but that his experience in South London had shown him that a great amount of the neglect was originally caused by colonies of foreigners, and especially Germans, who had

gathered in that part of London. Therefore, he thought that the neglect had penetrated every class of Society; and he agreed with his right reverend brother of London in thinking that the day of rest was necessary to the working man, but did not see what other time he had for observances of a religious nature. While he thought that over-strictness in Sabbatarianism had an injurious effect, as in Scotland, he was convinced that any further relaxation in this country would be still more injurious.

The House was in committee on the subject for an hour, at which the reporters were not present. Finally, the following resolution was moved, and agreed to unanimously:

That the attention of the Upper House of Convocation having been attracted to the relaxation of Sunday observance, which appears to have increased of late years, even among those who have the fullest leisure on other days, and to the great increase of Sunday labour, the House deems it to be its duty to appeal to the clergy, to all instructors of the young, and to all who exercise influence over their fellow-men, not to suffer this Church and country to lose the priceless benefit of the rest and sanctity of the Lord’s Day.* Its reasonable and religious observance is for the physical, moral, and spiritual health of all ranks of the population, and to it our national well-being has been largely due.

The foregoing is an abstract of the report in the *Daily Telegraph* of the debate in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury. One cannot help regretting that we do not have laid before us the various motives expressed in the hour of committee. Still, enough remains in the public speeches of their lordships to serve our purpose. We do not propose to criticise, for we wholly agree that the pursuit of pleasure at all times and seasons, and regardless

* We would refer the reader to *The Land of Cant*, by Sidney Whitman, for a review of the results produced in England by the strict observance of the Lord's Day—in the letter, and not in the spirit.

[The title of this work may be wrong. The only title somewhat resembling it is *Conventional Cant, its Results and Remedy*, by Sidney Whitman. London: K. Paul, Trench & Co., 1887. xix, 235 pp.—*Compiler*.]

SUNDAY DEVOTION TO PLEASURE

69

of others, is no good thing, but a selfish one. But we do traverse one thing: the Sabbath was indeed ordained for man, but nothing was said, even in those statutes so especially “ordained by God for the Jews,” as to the religious observances on that especial day. It was essentially a day of **REST**, ordained for man, as it was ordained that the land should lie fallow; that is to say, that there shall be no compulsory work for man, whether religious or secular. But granting that it is essentially a Day of Rest for overworked man, he is yet told by those who teach him religion that, instead of complete relaxation, he must follow “a religious observance.”

We would ask whether this “religious observance” is to be a farce or a reality? If a reality, it is a labour more fatiguing than any ordinary work; for it is an unaccustomed toil, and one which all except the very pious willingly eschew. Clergymen, whose business in life it is to lead the services, and who should, therefore, get accustomed to the labour, are exhausted by the work they have to do on Sundays, and to “feel Mondayish,” has become a recognised expression. As for children, who are taken to church regardless of their age and nature, many of them positively hate “church-going,” and so learn a horror of religion itself. Thus there is a forced “education,” in religion, instead of religion being the natural growth of the noblest part of the human heart. We thus offer to God not the things which are His, but “the things which are Caesar's”—the lip-service of humanity.

The whole Sunday-question resolves itself into the demand to know whether it is in any degree right, or in accordance with divine law, that man should be so devoted to selfish toil, during the week, as to have virtually no time or strength left for prayer (i.e., meditation) during the six days, and whether, therefore, it is right that the seventh day or Sunday should be set apart for it. All depends upon whether doing one's duty in the state of life to which one is called, is “doing,” or not doing, “all to the glory of God.” We think that work is prayer; and if so, the devotion of Sunday to innocent pleasure is really making it a day of rest.

Why should England set forth its observance of Sunday as the only one sanctioned by God? The present observance of Sunday in England is founded on the practices of the later and degenerate Jews, who were not upheld by Jesus in their observances. Even the prophets (vide *Nehemiah*, viii, 9-12) plainly show that the earlier usage was one of a day of rest, and that the idea of innocent pleasure, which is now represented as rather gross and sensual, was not then a forbidden thing. Reference to statistics in matters of drunkenness and crime does not show that England is, indeed, in possession of priceless benefits owing to the observance of Sunday, in which other nations, who do not share that observance, do not partake. Indeed it is by no means certain that in all those countries where there is indulgence in the class of pleasures so energetically condemned in the petition, there is not less crime and drunkenness than exists in England; and this, too, not merely during the week, but especially on the Sundays.

Without speaking of Catholic France, Spain, Italy, etc., etc., Greek orthodox Russia and all the Slavonian lands, take for example Protestant Germany, where all places of amusement are, if anything, more freely open than on other days, and Sunday is considered the best day for theatres, balls, and popular festivities. Surely the other nations, especially the Germans, are not less religious than in England.

To many who are cooped up during the week, a day in the country is an education which brings them nearer to God than all the services they could attend in a church. Of course, we may be met with a reference to the "two or three gathered together," but surely if God is omnipresent, He is with those who are truly grateful for the beauties of Nature.

No, my Lords, your protest may not fall flat, but it does not strike at the root of the evil:—the fact that you are unable to cope with the increasingly material conditions of life during the present age. The people are no longer ignorant, you have to meet men as clever as yourselves among those who pursue their pleasure in the way against which you protest. You will not get anyone to follow

your religious observances among those who have broken free from them, unless you can convince them that you are right, and that religion must be made the vital factor in their lives. Many of them recognise no "hereafter," and gaily follow the motto:—"Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." They recognise no god save their own pleasure; and we are both agreed that they are endeavouring to execute a "valse à deux temps" to the tune of the "danse macabre." Among the ranks of your church are many self-sacrificing men, who, from various motives, are endeavouring to help those of the working classes whose lives are lost in toil. Ask of them their opinion as to the "Lord's Day Observance" of religious duties. They have to deal with the practical difficulties of the situation. You, in your

Convocation, are protesting against an evil of which you are conscious, but against which you are powerless to act. Why? Because the form of religion you rely on has lost its hold upon the hearts of the people, and the “Service of Man,” according to the late Mr. James A. Cotter Morison, has replaced the “Service of God.”

The reason of this is not very far to seek. The Church has lost the key to Wisdom and Truth, and has endeavoured to bolster itself upon authority. The people have educated themselves to ask “Why?” And they will have an answer, or they will reject the Church and its teachings, for they will not accept authority. Religion and its principles must be demonstrated as mathematically as a problem of Euclid. But are you able to do so? Are any of the Church’s dogmas worth any of the tenets of Christ’s Sermon on the Mount, or the similar utterances to be found in all religions? Do you carry them out in their entirety in your lives, as the Episcopi of the Church? Do you, as such, take care that all your clergy do so? You may reply with a counter-question:—“Do you, our critics, do so and set us an example?” Our answer is, that we do not claim to be the “elect” or the “anointed of the Lord.” We are unpretending men and women, endeavouring to carry out the Golden Rule, apart from the ordinances of any form of worship. But you—you occupy a position which makes you an example to all men, and in which you have

taken a large responsibility. You stand before the world as exemplifying the effect of the dogmas of the Church you lead. That Church had and has its work to do, but that it has lost its power is plain, in that you are only able to protest, and that doubtfully, against an evil which you feel yourselves unable to check. In the language of your Scripture, how would it be if, as regards your trust, this night an account should be required of you?

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

March, 1888

THE LIFE PRINCIPLE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 7, March, 1888, pp. 37-42]

A few years back a very interesting controversy raged between several scientists of reputation. Some of these held that spontaneous generation was a fact in nature, whilst others proved the contrary; to the effect that, as far as experiments went, there was found to be biogenesis, or generation of life from previously existing life, and never the production of any form of life from non-living matter.

An erroneous assumption was made in the first instance that heat, equal to the boiling point of water, destroyed all life organisms; but by taking hermetically sealed vessels containing infusions, and subjecting them to such or a greater degree of heat, it was shown that living organisms did appear even after the application of so much heat. By more careful experiments, the following fact was brought to light, that spores of Bacteria, and other animalculae, which generally float in the air, can, when dry, withstand a greater degree of heat, and that when the experiments are made in optically pure air, no life ever appears, and the infusions never putrefy.

Along with the fact of biogenesis, we must note, however, Mr. Huxley's caution, when he says, "that with organic chemistry, molecular physics, and physiology yet in their infancy, and every day making prodigious strides, it would be the height of presumption for any man to say that the conditions under which matter assumes the

qualities called vital, may not some day be artificially brought together"; and, again, "that as a matter not of proof, but of probability, if it were given me to look beyond the abyss of geologically recorded time, to the still more remote period, when the earth was passing through chemical and physical conditions which it can never see again, I should expect to be a witness of the evolution of living protoplasms from non-living matter."

Tracing inorganic matter upwards to the form which approaches most nearly to vital organisms, we come to those complex substances called "colloids," which are something like the white of an egg, and form the last stage of the ascending line from inorganic matter to organic life.

Tracing life downwards we ultimately reach "protoplasm," called by Huxley "the physical basis of life," a colourless, jelly-like substance, absolutely homogeneous without parts or structure. Protoplasm is evidently the nearest approach of life to matter; and if life ever originated from atomic and molecular combinations, it was in this form.

Protoplasm in its substance is a nitrogenous carbon compound, differing only from other similar compounds of the albuminous family of colloid by the extremely complex composition of its atoms. Its peculiar qualities, including life, are not the result of any new and peculiar atom added to the known chemical compounds of the same family, but of the manner of grouping and motions of these elements. * Life in its essence is manifested by the faculties of nutrition, sensation, movement, and reproduction, and every speck of protoplasm develops organisms which possess these faculties. The question has been asked whether this primitive speck of protoplasm can be artificially manufactured by chemical processes. Science has answered in the

* *Vide* Mr. Samuel Laing's new book, *A Modern Zoroastrian*. The whole of the work is well worth study, as it is as interesting as it is scientific. Several quotations have been made in this article from that excellent volume.—N. D. K.

Notwithstanding its excellency, it is a very materialistic work.—H. P. B.

negative, as it knows as yet of no process by which any combination of inorganic matter could be vivified.

The law of evolution has now been satisfactorily proved to pervade the whole of the Universe, but there are several missing links, and, doubtless, the discoveries of modern science will in course of time bring many new facts to light on these obscure points which at present defy all search. Far more important than the question of the origin of species is the great problem of the development of life from what is looked upon as the inanimate mineral kingdom.

Every discovery of science, however limited it may be, affords food for thought, and enables us to understand how far we are to believe on the ground of observation and experiment, and how far we theorize in the right direction.

Science has not been able to prove the fact of "spontaneous generation" by experiment, but the best of scientists think it safe to believe that there must have been spontaneous generation * at one time. Thus far, scientific thought is in accord with esoteric teachings.

Occult philosophy has it, that motion, cosmic matter, duration, space, are everywhere. Motion is the imperishable life, and is conscious or unconscious, as the case may be. It exists as much during the active period of the Universe, as during Pralaya, or dissolution, when the unconscious life still maintains the matter † it animates in sleepless and unceasing motion.

. . . . Life is ever present in the atom or matter, whether organic or Inorganic conditioned or unconditioned—a difference that the occultists do not accept when life-energy is active in the atom, that atom is organic; when dormant or latent, then the atom is inorganic.... The "Jiva," or life-principle, which animates man,

* Esoteric Science, holding that nothing in nature is inorganic, but that every atom is a “life,” does not agree with “Modern Science” as to the meaning attached to “Spontaneous Generation.” We may deal with this later.—H. P. B.

† Esoteric Science does not admit of the “existence” of “matter,” as such, in Pralaya. In its noumenal state, dissolved in the “Great Breath,” or its “laya” condition, it can exist only *potentially*. Occult philosophy, on the contrary, teaches that, during Pralaya, “Naught is. All is ceaseless eternal Breath.”—H. P. B.

beast, plant or even a mineral, certainly *is* “a form of force indestructible,” since this force is the one life, or *anima mundi*, the universal living soul, and that the various modes in which the various objective things appear to us in nature in their atomic aggregations, such as minerals, plants, animals, etc., are all the different forms or states in which this force manifests itself. Were it to become, we will not say absent, for this is impossible, since it is omnipresent, but for one single instant inactive, say in a stone, the particles of the latter would lose instantly their cohesive property and disintegrate as suddenly—though the force would still remain in each of its particles, but in a dormant state. Thus the continuation of the sentence which states that, when this indestructible force is “disconnected with one set of atoms, it becomes attracted immediately by others” does not imply that it abandons entirely the first set, but only that it transfers its *vis viva* or living power, the energy of motion, to another set. But because it manifests itself in the next set as what is called Kinetic energy, it does not follow that the first set is deprived of it altogether; for it is still in it, as potential energy, or life latent.*

More than any other, the life principle in man is one with which we are most familiar, and yet are so hopelessly ignorant as to its nature. Matter and force are ever found allied. Matter without force, and force without matter, are inconceivable. In the mineral kingdom the universal life energy is one and unindividualized; it begins imperceptibly to differentiate in the vegetable kingdom, and from the lower animals to the higher animals, and man, the differentiation increases at every step in complex progression.

When once the life-principle has commenced to differentiate, and has become sufficiently individualized, does it keep to organisms of the same kind, or does it after the death of one organism go and vivify an organism of

* *Five Years of Theosophy*, orig. ed., pp. 534-35.

[This long passage is from H. P. B.’s explanation entitled “Transmigration of the Life-Atoms,” in reply to a letter from N. D. K., which was originally published in *The Theosophist*, Vol. IV, August, 1883, pp. 286-88. The complete text will be found in Volume V (1883) of the present Series. Quoted sentences within this excerpt are from the 1st instalment of “Fragments of Occult Truth,” published in *The Theosophist*, Vol. III, October, 1881, pp. 17-22.—*Compiler*.]

another kind? For instance, after the death of a man, does the Kinetic energy which kept him alive up to a certain time go after death and attach itself to a protoplasmic speck of the human kind, or does it go and vivify some animal or vegetable germ?*

After the death of a man, the energy of motion which vitalized his frame is said to be partly left in the particles of the dead body in a dormant state, while the main energy goes and unites itself with another set of atoms. Here a distinction is drawn between the dormant life left in the particles of the dead body and the remaining Kinetic

* As far as the writer knows, Occultism does not teach that the LIFE-PRINCIPLE—which is *per se* immutable, eternal, and as indestructible as the one causeless cause, for it is THAT in one of its aspects—can ever differentiate individually. The expression in *Five Years of Theosophy* must be misleading, if it led to such an inference. It is only each body—whether man, beast, plant, insect, bird, or mineral—which, in assimilating more or less the life principle, *differentiates it in its* own special atoms, and adapts it to this or another combination of particles, which combination determines the differentiation. The monad partaking in its universal aspect of the Parabrahmic nature, unites with its *monas* on the plane of differentiation to constitute an individual. This individual, being in its essence inseparable from Parabrahm, also partakes of the Life-Principle in its Parabrahmic or Universal Aspect. Therefore, at the death of a man or an animal, the manifestation of life or the evidences of Kinetic energy are only withdrawn to one of those subjective planes of existence which are not ordinarily objective to us. The amount of Kinetic energy to be expended during life by one particular set of physiological cells is allotted by Karma—another aspect of the Universal Principle—consequently when this is expended the conscious activity of man or animal is no longer manifested on the plane of those cells, and the chemical forces which they represent are disengaged and left free to act in the physical plane of *their* manifestation. *Jiva*—in its universal aspect—has, like *Prakriti*, its seven forms, or what we have agreed to call “principles.” Its action begins on the plane of the Universal Mind (*Mahat*) and ends in the grossest of the *Tanmtric* five planes—the last one, which is ours. Thus though we may, repeating after *Sankhya* philosophy, speak of the *seven prakritis* (or “productive productions”) or after the phraseology of the Occultists of the seven *jivas*—yet, *both Prakriti and Jiva are indivisible abstractions*, to be divided only out of condescension for the weakness of our human intellect. Therefore, also, whether we divide it into four, five or seven principles matters in reality very little.—H. P. B.

THE LIFE PRINCIPLE

77

energy, which passes off elsewhere to vivify another set of atoms. Is not the energy that becomes dormant * life in the particles of the dead body a lower form of energy than the Kinetic energy, which passes off elsewhere; and although during the life of a man they appear mixed up together, are they not two distinct forms of energy, united only for the time being?

A student of occultism writes as follows:

. *Jivatma* is subtle supersensuous matter, permeating the entire physical structure of the living being, and when it is separated from such structure life is said to become extinct.... A particular set of conditions is necessary for its connection with an animal structure, and when those conditions are disturbed, it is attracted by other bodies, presenting suitable conditions.†

Every atom has contained within it its own life, or force, and the various atoms which make up the physical frame always carry with them their own life wherever they travel.

The human or animal life-principle, however, which vitalizes the whole being, appears to be a progressed, differentiated, and individualized energy of motion, which seems to travel from organism to organism at each successive death. Is it really, as quoted above, “subtle supersensuous matter,” which is something distinct from the atoms that form the physical body? (1)

If so, it becomes a sort of a monad, and would be something akin to the higher human soul which transmigrates from body to body.

Another and more important question is:—Is the life-principle, or Jiva, something different from the higher or

* A dormant energy is *no* energy.

† *Five Years of Theosophy*, orig. ed., p. 512.

[This excerpt is from an article by Dharanidar Kauthumi, entitled “‘Odorigen’ and Jivatma,” which was originally published in *The Theosophist*, Vol. IV, July, 1883, p. 251. H. P. B. appended a brief footnote to this original article, stating that Jivatma applies in this case to the 2nd principle of man, and not the 7th principle of the Vedânta School, and ought to be properly called *Jîva* or *prâŚa*.—*Compiler*.]

spiritual soul? Some Hindoo Philosophers hold that these two principles are not distinct, but one and the same. (2)

To make the question plainer, it may be enquired whether occultism knows of cases in which human beings have been known to live quite separated from their spiritual soul? (3)

A correct comprehension of the nature, qualities, and mode of action of the principle, called “Jiva,” is very essential for a proper understanding of the very first principles of Esoteric Science, and it is with a view to elicit further information from those who have kindly promised to give help to the Editors of *Lucifer* on deep questions of the science, that this feeble attempt has been made to formulate a few questions which have been puzzling almost every student of Theosophy.

Ahmedabad.

N.D.K.*

* [These initials stand for Navroji Dorabji Khandâlâwala, who was a highly respected Judge and staunch friend of the Founders. He was initiated into the Theosophical Society on March 9, 1880, and later became President of the Poona Branch of the T.S.—*Compiler*.]

EDITOR’S NOTE

(1) Modern Science, tracing all vital phenomena to the molecular forces of the ordinal protoplasm, disbelieves in a *Vital Principle*, and in its materialistic negation laughs, of course, at the idea. Ancient Science, or Occultism, disregarding the laugh of ignorance,

asserts it as a fact. THE ONE LIFE—is deity itself, immutable, omnipresent, eternal. It is “subtle supersensuous matter” on this lower plane of ours, whether we call it one thing or the other; whether we trace it to the “Sun-force”—a theory by B.W. Richardson, F.R.S.—or call it this, that, or the other. The learned Dr. Richardson—an eminent authority—goes further than words, for he speaks of the life-principle as of “a form of MATTER”(!!). Says the great man of science: “I speak only of a veritable material agent, refined, it may be, to the

world at large, but actual and substantial: an agent having quality of weight and of volume; an agent susceptible of chemical combination, and thereby of change of physical state and condition; an agent passive in its action, moved always, that is to say, by influences apart from itself, obeying other influences; an agent possessing no initiative power, no *vis*, or *energia naturae*, but still playing a most important, if not a primary part in the production of the phenomena resulting from the action of the *energia* upon visible matter” * As one sees, the Doctor plays at blind man’s buff with occultism, and describes admirably the passive “life-elementals” used, say, by great sorcerers to animate their *homunculi*. Still the F.R.S. describes one of the countless aspects of our “subtle supersensuous-matter-life-principle.”

(2) And the Hindu philosophers are right. It is here that we have real need of the divisions of everything—Prakriti, Jiva, etc.—into principles to enable us to explain the action of *Jiva* on our low planes without degrading it. Thence, while the Vedantin philosopher may be content with four principles in his universal Kosmogony, we occultists need at least *seven* to enable ourselves to understand the difference of the Protean nature of the life-principle once it acts on the five lower spheres or planes.

Our readers, enamoured with Modern Science, at the same time as with the occult doctrines—have to choose between the two views of the nature of the Life-Principle, which are the most accepted now, and—the third view—that of the occult doctrines. The three may be described as follows:

I. That of the scientific “molecularists” who assert that life is the resultant *of the interplay of ordinary molecular forces*.

II. That which regards “living organisms” as animated by an independent “vital principle,” and declares “inorganic” matter to be lacking this.

* [*Theory of a Nervous Ether*, p. 363.]

III. The Occultist or Esoteric standpoint, which looks upon the distinction between organic and inorganic matter as fallacious and non-existent in nature. For it says that matter in all its phases being merely a vehicle for the manifestation *through it* of LIFE—the Parabrahmic Breath—in its physically pantheistic aspect (as Dr. Richardson would say, we suppose) it is a super-sensuous state of matter, *itself* the vehicle of the ONE LIFE, the unconscious purposiveness of Parabrahm.

(3) It is just this. A human being *can* “live” quite separated from his Spiritual Soul—the 7th and 6th principles of the ONE LIFE or “Atma-Buddhi”; but no being—whether human or animal—can live separated from its *physical* Soul, *Nephesh* or the *Breath of Life* (in *Genesis*). These “*seven souls*” or *lives* (that which we call Principles) are admirably described in the Egyptian *Ritual* and the oldest papyri. Chabas has unearthed curious papyri and Mr. Gerald Massey has collected priceless information upon this doctrine; and though his conclusions are not ours, we may yet in a future number quote the facts he gives, and thus show how the oldest philosophy known to Europe—the Egyptian—corroborates our esoteric teachings.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

March, 1888

FROM *LUCIFER* TO A FEW READERS

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 7, March, 1888, pp. 68-71]

After waiting vainly for three months for a reply to the article "LUCIFER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY," during which time the Editors have been flooded with letters of congratulation from all parts of the world, an *epistle* from which we print extracts has been received. The letters which approved of our "Christmas letter" to his Grace—every intelligent man who read it finding only words of praise for it—were all signed. Two or three abusive and villainous little notes *were anonymous*. The

FROM LUCIFER TO A FEW READERS

81

"epistle" referred to is signed with a name picked out of a novel, though the writer is known to us, of course, nor does he conceal his identity. But the latter is not sufficient guarantee for his ill-considered interference. For all that can be said of his letter, is that:—

"He knew not what to say, and so he swore."—BYRON.*

We must now be permitted to explain why we do not print it. There is more than one reason for this.

First of all, our readers can feel but little interest in the matter; and the majority (an enormous one) having approved of *Lucifer's* "LETTER," one solitary opponent who dissents from that majority must be an authority indeed, to claim the right to be heard. Now, as he is by no means an *authority*, especially in the question raised, since he is not even an *orthodox Christian*, "sincere, if not over-wise," and since he only expresses his *personal* opinion, we do not see why we should inflict upon our subscribers that opinion—however honest it may be—when the majority of other personal opinions is unanimous in holding quite an opposite view? Again, although the principle on which our magazine *is* and has always been conducted, is to admit to its columns every criticism *when just and impartial*, on our teachings, doctrines, and even on the policy and doings of the theosophical body, yet we can hardly be required to sacrifice the limited space in our *Monthly* to the expression of *every* opinion, whether good, bad, or indifferent. Then, it so happens that the two chief characteristics of our critic's letter are: (a) a weakness in argument which makes it almost painful to read; and (b) *personal* rudeness, not to say abuse, which cannot in any way be material to the argument. *Abusus non tollit usum*. The "Argument," if it can be so dignified,

* [*The Island*, Canto III, v, lines 11-12:

“Jack was embarrass’d—
never hero more,
And as he knew not what
to say, he swore.”

—*Compiler.*]

is based on quite a false conception of the “Letter to the Archbishop,” and we could really deal only with a *Reply* to that “Letter,” raising one point after the other, and answering the facts which have been brought forward. But this letter contains nothing of the kind. So we shall deal with the subject in general, and notice but a few sentences from it.

Surprised to find that our now famous “Letter” has called forth no comment in our pages the writer remarks:—

Containing, as it did, such an unwarrantable attack on the institution of which he [the Archbishop] is the head, perhaps had the matter been allowed to rest, and the article allowed to die a natural death, no comment would have appeared necessary; but as Theosophists have thought it necessary to republish *their folly*, and fling it before the world, *like a “Red rag”* to a Bull, it is, I consider, high time that some one, at least, should endeavour to dissuade them from *the foolishly suicidal policy* they are pursuing.

The “folly” is the reprinting of the “Letter” in 15,000 copies, sent all over the world. Now this “folly” and “foolishly suicidal policy” were resorted to just in consequence of the masses of letters received by us, all thanking *Lucifer* for showing a courage no one else was prepared to show; and for stating publicly and openly that which is repeated and complained of *ad nauseam* in secret and privacy by the whole world, save by blind bigots. With an inconsistency worthy of regret the writer himself admits it. For he says:

No one can deny, of course, that the article in question contained in its underlying spirit much that was true, especially in some of the remarks relative to a narrow and dogmatic Christianity, which we know to exist, and which has been realized by, and lamented often within the pale of the Church itself; and which all good and wide-minded Christians themselves deplore and fight against—so that Theosophy is not a discoverer here of any new truth!

Thus, after admitting virtually the truth and justice of what we said in our “LETTER,” the writer can take us to task *only for not being the “DISCOVERERS”* of that truth! Was the pointing out of slavery in the United States as an *infamous institution*, supported and defended by the Church, Bishops and Clergy—any discovery of a new truth? And are the Northern States which broke it by

waving that *infamy* as a “Red rag” before the Southern Bull to be accused of folly? More than one misguided, though probably sincere critic, has accused them of “foolishly suicidal policy.” Time and success have avenged the noble States, that fought for human freedom, against a Church, which supported on the strength of a few idiotic words placed in Noah’s mouth against Ham, the most fiendish law that has ever been enacted; and their detractors and critics must have looked—*very silly*, after the war.

Our critic tries to frighten us in no measured language. Speaking of the “LETTER” as an article:—

Whose writer seems to have steeped his pen in the gall of a scurrility worthy of the correspondence of a tenth-rate society journal,
—he asks us to believe:—

That such an article is only calculated to bring what should be a great and noble work into the contempt of the entire thinking community—a contempt from which it will never rise again!

No truth spoken in earnest sincerity can ever bring the speaker of it into contempt, except, perhaps, with one class of men: those who selfishly prefer their personal reputation, the benefits they may reap with the majority which profits by and lives on crying social evils, rather than openly fight the latter. Those again, who will uphold every retrograde notion, however injurious, only because it has become part and parcel of national custom; and who will defend *cant*—that which Webster and other dictionaries define as “whining, hypocritical pretensions to goodness”—even while despising it—rather than risk their dear selves against the above mentioned howling majority. The Theosophical Society, or rather the few working members of it in the West, court such “contempt,” and feel proud of it.

We are told further:—

Should his Grace have *deigned* to answer your article, I presume he would have replied somewhat in this wise. “I have to provide spiritual food for upwards of 22,000,000 souls, of whom probably upwards of 20,000,000 are ignorant people without the power of thought, and certainly without the smallest capacity for grasping an abstract idea; can you provide me with any better form of Esoteric machinery for feeding and supplying them?” Theosophy answers, “No”!!!

Three answers are given to the above:

(a) Somebody higher than even his “Grace”—his Master, in fact, “deigned” to answer even those who sought to crucify Him, and is said to have made his best friends of publicans and sinners. Why should not the Bishop of Canterbury answer *our* article? Because, we say, *it is unanswerable*.

(b) We maintain that the majority of the 20,000,000 receives *a stone* instead of the bread of life (the “spiritual food”). Otherwise, whence the ever-growing materialism, atheism and disgust for the dead-letter of the purely ritualistic Church and its Theology?

(c) Give theosophy half the means at the command of the Primates of all England and

their Church, and then see whether it would not find a “better form” and means to relieve the starving and console the bereaved.

Therefore, our critics have no right, so far, having no knowledge what theosophy would do, had it only the means—to answer for it—“No.” Theosophy is able, at any rate, to furnish “His Grace” if he but asks the question suggested by our critics—“Yes, theosophy can provide you with a better form . . . for feeding the multitudes, both physically and spiritually.” To do this is easy. It only requires that the Primates and Bishops, Popes and Cardinals, throughout the world should become the Apostles of *Christ practically*, instead of remaining priests of Christ, nominally. Let them each and all, the Lord Primate of England starting the noble example, give up their gigantic salaries and palaces, their useless paraphernalia and personal as well as Church luxury. The Son of Man “hath not *where to lay his head*” [Matt., viii, 20], and like the modern priests of Buddha, the highest as the lowest, had but one raiment over his body for all property; whereas again—God “dwelleth not in temples made with hands,” says Paul.* Let the Church, we say, become

* [Reference is here made to the passage in *Hebrews*, ix, 24, which runs thus: “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true . . .”—*Compiler*.]

really the Church of Christ, and not merely the State-Church. Let Archbishops and Bishops live henceforth, if not as poor, homeless, and penniless, as Jesus was, at least, as *thousands of their starving curates do*. Let them turn every cathedral and church into hospitals, refuges, homes for the homeless, and secular schools; preach as Christ and the Apostles are said to have preached: in the open air, under the sunny and starry vault of heaven, or in portable tents, and *teach people daily morality instead of incomprehensible dogmas*. Are we to be told that if all the gigantic Church revenues, now used to embellish and build churches, to provide Bishops with palaces, carriages, horses, and flunkies, their wives with diamonds and their tables with rich viands and wines; are we to be told that if all those moneys were put together, there could be found in England one starving man, woman, or child? **NEVER!**

To conclude:—

Our opponents seem to have entirely missed the point of our article, and to have, in consequence, wandered very far afield. As a further result, our latest critic seems to give vent to his criticism from a point of view very much more hostile than that he complains of. As his criticism is in general terms, and does not deal with any mistakes and inaccuracies, we content ourselves with pointing out, to him and all other assailants, what we hoped was plain—the real purport of our letter to the Archbishop.

His Grace was not “attacked” in any personal sense whatever; he was addressed solely in consequence of his position as the clerical head of the Church of England.

The clergy were spoken of and addressed throughout as “stewards of the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven.” They were addressed as the “spiritual teachers” of men, not as “the doers of good works.” It was asserted that the vast majority of the clergy, owing to their ignorance of esoteric truth and their own growing materiality, are unable to act as “spiritual teachers.” Consequently, they cannot give to those who regard them in that light that which is required. Many persons are now in doubt

whether religion is a human institution or a divine one; this because the Church has lost the “keys” to the “mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven,” and is unable to help people to enter therein. Moreover “the Doctrine of Atonement,” and the denunciatory Athanasian tenet, “he that believeth not shall be damned,” are, to many, so absolutely repulsive that they will not listen at all. Witness the Rev. T. G. Headley and his recent articles in *Lucifer*.

Finally, our assailant’s ill-veiled personal attacks on the leaders of the Theosophical movement are beside the mark. To demand that those leaders should, as evidence of their faith, take part in “good works,” or philanthropy, when with all the sincere good-will, they lack the means, is equivalent to taunting them with their poverty. All honour to the clergy, in spite of the “black sheep” amongst them, for their self-sacrificing efforts. But the Church, as such, fails to do the duty which is required of it. To do this duty adequately, exoteric religion must have esoteric Knowledge behind it. Hence the clergy must study Theosophy and become, though not necessarily members of the Society, *practical Theosophists*.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

March, 1888

RE THE BRAIN THEOREM OF THE UNIVERSE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 7, March, 1888, p. 71]

To the Editors of *Lucifer*.

Kindly permit me to direct attention to the ADVERSARY'S garbled quotation of a sentence which quite distorts my meaning. At page 510, 2nd column, of *Lucifer* for February, is the following passage: "In the teeth of all the scientific luminaries, from Faraday to Huxley, who all confess to knowing NOTHING [which is surely rather too much of a negation] (I) of matter, [Dr. Lewins] declares that—'Matter organic and inorganic, *is now fully known*'" (*Auto-Centricism*, page 40). On turning to this reference, I find my declaration runs thus, and consequently gives quite a different complexion to my position than that implied by my critic.

RE THE BRAIN THEOREM OF THE UNIVERSE

87

"Matter, organic and inorganic, between which no real veil of partition exists,* is now fully known by Medicine to perform, *unaided by 'Spiritual' agency*, all material operations. (2) That fact, though ignored by Newton, was the real outcome of his *mechanical* theory of the Universe. As soon as he demonstrated innate activity or attractive energy, the push and pull of every atom of matter, the intrusion of a 'spiritual' agency was at once abrogated."

Indeed, it really is quite unthinkable to predicate the interaction of such incompatible elements (concepts) as corporeity and incorporeity. *Cui bono* nerves or other somatic structures, for the conduction of an *unsubstantial substance* (Archaeus)? The idea is as inconceivable as inexpressible. The contradiction is quite a *reductio ad impossibile*. It runs on all fours with Descartes' Pineal Gland hypothesis of the "Soul." (3)

ROBERT LEWINS, M.D.

EDITORS' NOTE.—(1) Many passages from the most eminent physicists of the day could be quoted to prove that there can never be "*too much* of a negation" in such confessions of ignorance upon this subject. No one knows to this hour the ultimate structure or essence of matter. Hitherto, Science has never yet succeeded in decomposing a single one of the many simple bodies, *miscalled* "elementary substances." So far do our materialists stray, *nolens volens*, into metaphysics, that they are not even sure if molecules *are realities*, or a simple fancy based on false perceptions! "There may be no such things as molecules . . ." writes Prof. J. P. Cooke, in his *New Chemistry*, ". . . the new chemistry assumes as its fundamental postulate, that the magnitudes we call molecules are realities;

but this is only a postulate.” Can any critic assume, after this, “*too much of a negation*”?

* Chemistry, as I have elsewhere stated, since Wöhler’s laboratory manufacture of the organic compound *Urea*, has quite unified organic and inorganic “Nature.” What used to figure in chemical text books as “Organic Chemistry,” is now treated of as “Carbon Compounds.”

The solution of continuity is formal and apparent only, not real. “ Things “ are indeed not as they seem.

(2) How, then, does Medicine, or any other Science, *fully know* that matter performs *unaided* by “*Spiritual*” agency, all material operations? All they know is, that they are ignorant even of the *reality* of their molecules, let alone invisible primordial matter. And it is just with regard to the *natural functions of the grey matter in the brain*, and the action of the mind or consciousness, that Tyndall has declared that were we even enabled to *see and feel* the very molecules of the brain, still *the chasm between the two classes of phenomena would be “intellectually impassable.”* How, then, can Dr. Lewins say of that which all naturalists, biologists, psychologists (with the exception, perhaps, of Haeckel, who is undeniably mad on the question of his own omniscience) have proclaimed *unknowable* to human intellect, that it is “*fully known* to Medicine,” of all Sciences (with the exception of Surgery) the most tentative, hypothetical and uncertain?

(3) Descartes showed some consistency at least, while putting forth his hypothesis about the *pineal gland*. He would not talk upon a subject and predicate of an organ that *which it is not* when entirely ignorant of what it may be. In this he was wiser in his generation than the philosophers and physicists who came after him. Now-adays, the Science of Physiology knows no more than Descartes did of the pineal gland, and the spleen, and a few more mysterious organs in the human body. Yet, even in their great ignorance they will deny point-blank any *spiritual* agency there, where they are unable to perceive and follow even the material operations. VANITY AND CONCEIT are thy names, oh, young Physiology! And a peacock’s feather in the tail of the XIXth century crow, is the fittest emblem that *Lucifer* can offer the present generation of “Subtle Doctors.”



DR. ANNA BONUS KINGSFORD
(1846-1888)

From a photograph taken July 12, 1883. Reproduced from
Isabel de Steiger's *Memorabilia*, where it is credited to
Mr. Samuel Hopgood Hart.
(For biographical sketch see the *Bio-Bibliographical Index*)

***Collected Writings* VOLUME IX**
March, 1888

THE LATE MRS. ANNA KINGSFORD

89

THE LATE MRS. ANNA KINGSFORD, M. D. OBITUARY

OBITUARY

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 7, March, 1888, pp. 78-79]

We have this month to record with the deepest regret the passing away from this physical world of one who, more than any other, has been instrumental in demonstrating to her fellow-creatures the great fact of the conscious existence—hence of the immortality—of the inner Ego.

We speak of the death of Mrs. Anna Kingsford, M.D., which occurred on Tuesday, the 28th of February, after a somewhat painful and prolonged illness. Few women have worked harder than she has, or in more noble causes; none with more success in the cause of humanitarianism. Hers was a short but a most useful life. Her intellectual fight with the vivisectionists of Europe, at a time when the educated and scientific world was more strongly fixed in the grasp of materialism than at any other period in the history of civilisation, alone proclaims her as one of those who, regardless of conventional thought, have placed themselves at the very focus of the controversy, prepared to dare and brave all the consequences of their temerity. Pity and Justice to animals were among Mrs. Kingsford's favourite texts when dealing with this part of her life's work; and by reason of her general culture, her special training in the science of medicine, and her magnificent intellectual power, she was enabled to influence and work in the way she desired upon a very large proportion of those people who listened to her words or who read her writings. Few women wrote more graphically, more takingly, or possessed a more fascinating style.

Mrs. Kingsford's field of activity, however, was not limited to the purely physical, mundane plane of life. She was a Theosophist and a true one at heart; a leader of spiritual and philosophical thought, gifted with most exceptional psychic attributes. In connection with Mr. Edward Maitland, her truest friend—one whose incessant,

watchful care has undeniably prolonged her delicate ever-threatened life for several years, and who received her last breath—she wrote several books dealing with metaphysical and mystical subjects. The first and most important was *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, which gives the esoteric meaning of Christianity. It sweeps away many of the

difficulties that thoughtful readers of the Bible must contend with in their endeavours to either understand or accept literally the story of Jesus Christ as it is presented in the Gospels.

She was for some time President of the “London Lodge” of the Theosophical Society, and, after resigning that office, she founded “The Hermetic Society” for the special study of Christian mysticism. She herself, though her religious ideas differed widely on some points from Eastern philosophy, remained a faithful member of the Theosophical Society and a loyal friend to its leaders.* She was one, the aspirations of whose whole life were ever turned toward the eternal and the true. A mystic by nature—the most ardent one to those who knew her well—she was still a very remarkable woman even in the opinion of the materialists and the unbelievers. For, besides her remarkably fine and intellectual face, there was that in her which arrested the attention of the most unobserving and foreign to any metaphysical speculation. For, as Mrs. F. Fenwick Miller writes, though Mrs. Kingsford’s mysticism was “simply unintelligible” to her, yet we find that this does not prevent the writer from perceiving the truth. As she describes her late friend, “I have never known a woman so exquisitely beautiful as she who cultivated her brain so assiduously.... I have never known a woman in whom the dual nature that is more or less perceptible in every human creature was so strongly marked †—so sensuous, so feminine on the one

* Both Mr. Maitland and Mrs. Kingsford had resigned from the “London Lodge of the Theosophical Society,” but not from the Parent Society.

† The statement made by some papers that Mrs. Kingsford did not find her resting place in psychic force, for “she died a Roman

hand, so spirituelle, so imaginative on the other hand.” *

The spiritual and psychic nature had always the upper hand over the sensuous and feminine; and the circle of her mystically-inclined friends will miss her greatly, for such women as she are not numerous in the same century. The world in general has lost in Mrs. Kingsford one who can be very ill-spared in this era of materialism. The whole of her adult life was passed in working unselfishly for others, for the elevation of the spiritual side of humanity. We can, however, in regretting her death take comfort in the thought that good work cannot be lost nor die, though the worker is no longer among us to watch for the fruit. And Anna Kingsford’s work will be still bearing fruit even when her memory has been obliterated with the generations of those who knew her well, and new generations will have approached the psychic mysteries still nearer.

Catholic,” is utterly false. The boasts made by the R.C. *Weekly Register* (March 3 and March 10, 1888) to the

effect that she died in the bosom of the Church, having abjured her views, psychism, theosophy, and even her *Perfect Way*, and writings in general, have been vigorously refuted in the same paper by her husband, Rev. A. Kingsford, and Mr. Maitland. We are sorry to hear that her last days were embittered by the mental agony inflicted upon her by an unscrupulous nun, who, as Mr. Maitland declared to us, was smuggled in *as a nurse*—and who did nothing but bother her patient, “importune her, and pray.” That Mrs. Kingsford was entirely against the *theology* of the Church of Rome, though believing in Catholic doctrines, may be proved by one of her last letters to us, on “poor slandered St. Satan,” in connection with certain attacks on the name of our Journal, *Lucifer*. We have preserved this and several other letters, as they were all written between September, 1887 and January, 1888. They thus remain eloquent witnesses against the pretensions of the *Weekly Register*. For they prove that Mrs. Kingsford had not abjured her views, nor that she died “in fidelity to the Catholic Church.”

* [“Woman: Her Position and Her Prospects, Her Duties and Her Doings,” *Lady’s Pictorial*, London, March 3, 1888.—*Compiler*.]

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
March, 1888

92

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

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

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 7, March, 1888, pp. 83-84]

SCIENTIFIC NOTES

De Profundis!

The world of science has just sustained a heavy loss, an irreparable one, it is feared. The blow falls especially heavy on two men of science. For the great calamity which deprives at once humanity of a new and lovely, albeit gelatinous forefather, and the German Darwin of the very topmost leaf from his crown of scientific laurels, strikes simultaneously Messrs. Haeckel and Huxley. One, as all the world—except ignoramuses, of course—knows, was the fond parent of the late lamented *Bathybius Haeckelii*—just passed away—or shall we say *transfigured?*—the other, the god-father of that tender sea-flower, the jelly-speck of the oceans. . . .*

“Woe is me! for I am undone,” cried Isaiah [vi, 5], upon seeing the “Lord of Hosts” appear as smoke. “Woe are we!” exclaim both Messrs. Huxley and Haeckel upon finding their occult progeny—the *Moneron*—*Bathybius* that was—turning under pitiless chemical analysis into a vulgar pinch of *precipitate of sulphate of lime!* And, as with a great cry, they fall into each other’s arms:

“They weep each other’s woe.

.

O woeful day! O day of woe!”

repeat, Greek-chorus-like, all the learned bodies of the two continents, of the Old and of the New World.

Alas, alas, young *Bathybius* exists no more! Nay, worse, for it is now being ascertained that he has never

* *Vide* first number of *Lucifer*, page 78, “Literary Jottings.”

had any existence at all—except, perhaps, in the too credulous scientific brains of a few naturalists.

Requiescat in pace, sweet, dream-like myth, whose gelatinous appearance befooled even two great Darwinists and led them right into the meshes of crafty *Maya*! But—“*De mortuis nil nisi bonum*”—we know, we know. Still it is not saying evil of the poor ex-Bathybius, I hope, to remember he is now but a pinch of lime. *Horribile dictu*: in whom shall, or can we, place henceforth our trust? Whither shall we turn for a primordial ancestor, now that even that jelly-like stranger has been taken away from us? Verily, we are stranded; and humanity, an orphan once more, is again as it was before—a parish-babe in Kosmos, without father, mother, or even a second-hand god in the shape of a Bathybius as a foundation-stone to stand upon! Woe! Woe!

But there may be still some balm left in Gilead. If our ever to be lamented ancestor, breaking under a too severe analysis, has ceased to be a protoplasmic entity, it is still a salt. And are we not assured that we “are the salt of the earth?” Besides which we are salt-generating animals anyhow, and therefore may still hope to be related with the late Bathybius. Decidedly, mankind has little to lament for. Haeckel and Mr. Huxley are thus the chief and only sufferers.

No wonder, then, that the Royal Society is said to go into deep mourning for a whole lunar month. Moreover, the “F.R.S.’s” should not fail to send Dr. Aveling to Berlin to carry the expression of their deep collective sympathy to poor Dr. Haeckel for the bereavement they have caused to him. For, *firstly*—who fitter than the eminent translator of the *Pedigree of Man* to offer consolation to the eminent German naturalist, the author of *Anthropogenesis* and other inspired volumes? And *secondly*—it is a case of “Science *versus* Science.” It is the right

hand of Science which has robbed her left hand of her promising progeny—the *Bathybius Haeckelii*. We have but one more instance like this one in history—namely, the sad case of Count Ugolino. Walled-in, in the famous tower, in company with his family to starve, the generous and self-sacrificing nobleman fearing to leave his children orphans—devoured them one after the other—“lest they should remain fatherless,” explains the legend.

But I perceive—too late, I am afraid—that the case as above cited has little, if any, analogy with the case in hand. Ugolino ate his sons, and Haeckel—did not eat his son, Bathybius? Yet Well—I give it up! *

MEMO—Apply to the pellucid Solipsism of the Hylo-Idealists to get me out of this bog of the two sets of “sons”—the sons of Ugolino and the “first-born” of Haeckel. . . .

RELIGIOUS NOTES

My Perplexities.

Here would be the right place for another MEMO.—“To ask the Bishop of Canterbury,” etc., etc. But his Grace, I fear, will refuse to enlighten me.

* [Reference is here to Ugolino della Gherardesca (1220-89), Count of Donoratico, who was the head of a powerful family, the chief Ghibelline house of Pisa. After the defeat of the Pisans by the Genoese in 1284, he was accused of treason. Civil war broke out in Pisa in 1288, stirred up by Ugolino’s rival the archbishop Ruggieri, who captured the count, his two sons and nephews, and starved them to death in the Muda, a tower belonging to the Gualandi family. According to a curious legend, Ugolino devoured his sons, in order “to keep alive for them their father”! Dante has portrayed his sufferings in his *Inferno*, where he represents Ugolino as voraciously devouring the head of Ruggieri, both of them being frozen in a lake of ice.—*Compiler*.]

I have just finished reading the excellent article in *Lucifer’s* French contemporary, *l’Aurore*, on the ten lost tribes of Israel. It would appear from the weighty proofs in the context that it is the English, the Anglo-Saxon nation, after all, which are those lost tribes. Well, may they prosper better in the bosom of Abraham than they are likely to in that of Christ. But there is a little difficulty in the way.

Ecclesiastical History teaches, and profane science does not deny, that since the days of Tiglath-pileser, who carried three tribes and one-half a tribe beyond the Euphrates (2 *Kings*, xv, 29; *1 Chron.*, v, 26); and Shalmanaser, King of Assyria, who carried also beyond the Euphrates the rest of the tribes, there was “the end of the Kingdom of the ten tribes of Israel.” In other words, no one heard of them any longer. “The tribes never did return,” the good old Crudens tells us. Nor were they ever heard of. This was in 758 and 678 B.C.

But—and here comes the rub. If this is so, then the *Septuagint*—the ark of salvation of all the Protestant Churches and its hundreds of bastard sects—is a *living lie*, name and all. For what is the history of the famous *Septuagint*? Ptolemy Philadelphus, who lived some 250 years B.C., curious to read the Hebrew law in Greek, “wrote to Eleazar,* the high priest of the Jews, to send him *six men from each of the twelve tribes* of Israel to translate the law for him into Greek.” Thus say Philo Judaeus and Josephus, and add that *six men of each tribe were sent*, and the *Septuagint* written.

Query: Considering that ten tribes out of twelve had been lost nearly 400 years before the day of Ptolemy, and had “*never returned*”—whom did Eleazar send to Alexandria? Spooks may have been rife in those days as they are in ours?

* Or is it Ariamnes II? For *historical* chronology is muddled up. . . .

PROFANE NOTES

Perplexities (continued).

I have seen mediums (for “fire and flame phenomena” as they are called in America) take burning live coals in their hands and closing their fingers upon them never even get a burn. I have seen others handle red-hot and white-hot lamp-glasses, pokers, and have heard from several trustworthy eye-witnesses that the medium D. D. Home used to cool his countenance, when entranced; by burying his face in a bed of live coals in the grate of the fire-place, not a hair of his head being singed; and he took up handfuls of burning coals with naked hands and even gave them to other persons to hold—without any injury.

And having seen all this, and heard all this, what am I to think, when I find Isaiah saying (vi, 6), “Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having *a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the TONGS* from off the altar.”

Query: Why such precautions?

Why should a seraph need *tongs*? A seraph is higher than a common angel—for he is an angel of the highest order in the celestial hierarchy. Moreover, the plural of the word *seraph* means “burning, fiery,” hence of the same nature as the fire. Shall we infer from this that spiritual mediums are of a still higher hierarchy than even seraphs?

A Heathen Brother, a high graduate, writes: “This week a zealous *padri* pestered us

with questions I could not answer. He clamoured to be told why if we write after our names, 'M.A.'s' and 'B.A.'s,' we persist in believing various doctrines taught in the *Purânas*. 'How can you, O foolish Gentiles,' he exclaimed; 'Why should you, O god-forsaken, unregenerate idolaters,' he cried, 'believe that not only did your Brahmâ form birds from his vital vigour, sheep from his breast, goats from his

mouth, kine from his belly, horses, deer and elephants from his sides, whilst from the hairs of his body sprang herbs, roots, plants, etc.; but even that sun and moon, fishes in the seas and fowls in the air, stones and trees rivers and mountains, that all the animate and inanimate nature, in short, talks with your false god and praises, making *puja* (obeisance) to him!' What could I answer to this irate father, who called our sacred scriptures silly *fairy tales*, and proclaimed the supremacy of his religion over ours? Already visions of Jordan and baptism have begun to haunt my restless dreams. I cannot bear to be laughed at by one, the doctrines of whose religion seem so infinitely superior in matter of Science to ours. Advise and help me. . . ."

I sent him in answer the *Book of Common Prayer*, according to the use of the Church of England. I marked the "Morning Prayer," No. 8, the *Benedicite, omnia opera Domini*, for him with a red cross, to read to his *padri* at the first opportunity. For there, filling over three columns, we find: "Oh, ye Sun and Moon, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him for ever." "Oh, ye Whales and Wells, Seas and Floods, Fowls of the Air, and all ye Beasts and Cattle, Mountains, and Green things upon the Earth, Ice and Snow, Frost and Cold, Fire and Heat, etc., etc., bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him for ever."

This, I believe, will moderate the zeal of the good missionary. The difference between the fish and fowls cereals, plants and whales, and other marketable product of sea and land of the Heathen, and those of the Christian, seems quite imperceptible to an unbiassed mind.

Decidedly, the promise of the Jewish God, "I shall give you the heathen for your inheritance," seems premature.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
March, 1888

98

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 7, March, 1888, pp. 6-7, 80-81]

[*Absolute Truth is self-evident*] “Self-evident” truth may be considered *absolute* in relation to this Earth—only casually. It is still relative, not *absolute* with regard to its Universal Absoluteness.

[H. P. B. refers the reader to her editorial “What is Truth?,” *Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 6, February, 1888, pp. 425-33.]

[The following statement is made in an article: “The original *One*, manifesting itself as *Substance* ... and *Power* . . . cannot be essentially . . . different from its own productions. . . . Nor could Matter and Motion continue to exist if the self-existent cause that enables them to continue to exist were to cease to be. . . .” To this, H. P. B. appends the following footnote:]

But can the Absolute have any relation to the conditioned or the finite? Reason and metaphysical philosophy answer alike—No. The “Self-existent” can only be the Absolute, and esoteric philosophy calls it therefore the “Causeless Cause,” the Absolute Root of all, with no attributes, properties or conditions. It is the one UNIVERSAL LAW of which immortal man is a part, and which, therefore, he senses under the only possible aspects—those of absolute immutability transformed into absolute activity—on this plane of illusion—or eternal ceaseless motion, the *ever Becoming*. Spirit, Matter, Motion, are the three attributes, on this our plane. In that of self-existence the three are ONE and indivisible. Hence we say that Spirit, Matter, and Motion are eternal, because one, under three aspects. Our differences, however, in this excellent paper, are simply in terms and expressions or FORM—not in ideas or thought.

[vitality] Of which “vitality” biologists know no more than of the man in the moon.

[each unit of sentient creation *must* say, “*l’univers c’est moi.*”] Just what every Brahmin and every Vedantin says when repeating: *Aham eva parabrahma*, “I am myself Brahma or the Universe.”

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

CONVERSATIONS ON OCCULTISM

[*The Path*, New York, Vol. III, Nos. 1-6, April, May, June, July, August, September, 1888, pp. 17-21, 54-58, 94-96, 125- 129, 160- 163, and 187- 192 respectively]

THE KALI YUGA—THE PRESENT AGE

Student.—I am very much puzzled about the present age. Some theosophists seem to abhor it as if wishing to be taken away from it altogether, inveighing against modern inventions such as the telegraph, railways, machinery, and the like, and bewailing the disappearance of former civilizations. Others take a different view, insisting that this is a better time than any other, and hailing modern methods as the best. Tell me, please, which of these is right, or, if both are wrong, what ought we to know about the age we live in.

Sage.—The teachers of Truth know all about this age. But they do not mistake the present century for the whole cycle. The older times of European history, for example, when might was right and when darkness prevailed over Western nations, was as much a part of this age, from the standpoint of the Masters, as is the present hour, for the Yuga—to use a Sanskrit word—in which we are now had begun many thousands of years before. And during that period of European darkness, although this Yuga had already begun, there was much light, learning, and civilization in India and China. The meaning of the words “present age” must therefore be extended over a far greater period than is at present assigned. In fact, modern science has reached no definite conclusion yet as to what should properly be called “an age,” and the truth of the Eastern doctrine is denied. Hence we find writers speaking

100

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

of the “Golden Age,” the “Iron Age,” and so on, whereas they are only parts of the real age that began so far back that modern archaeologists deny it altogether.

Student.—What is the Sanskrit name for this age, and what is its meaning?

Sage.—The Sanskrit is “Kali,” which added to Yuga gives us “Kali-Yuga.” The meaning of it is “Dark Age.” Its approach was known to the ancients, its characteristics are described in the Indian poem the *Mahabharata*. As I said that it takes in an immense period of the glorious part of Indian history, there is no chance for anyone to be jealous and to say that we are comparing the present hour with that wonderful division of Indian development.

Student.—What are the characteristics to which you refer, by which *Kali-Yuga* may be known?

Sage.—As its name implies, darkness is the chief. This of course is not deducible by comparing to-day with 800 A.D., for this would be no comparison at all. The present

century is certainly ahead of the middle ages, but as compared with the preceding Yuga it is dark. To the Occultist, material advancement is not of the quality of light, and he finds no proof of progress in merely mechanical contrivances that give comfort to a few of the human family while the many are in misery. For the darkness he would have to point but to one nation, even the great American Republic. Here he sees a mere extension of the habits and life of the Europe from which it sprang; here a great experiment with entirely new conditions and material was tried; here for many years very little poverty was known; but here to-day there is as much grinding poverty as anywhere, and as large a criminal class with corresponding prisons as in Europe, and more than in India. Again, the great thirst for riches and material betterment, while spiritual life is to a great extent ignored, is regarded by us as darkness. The great conflict already begun between the wealthy classes and the poorer is a sign of darkness. Were spiritual light prevalent, the rich and the poor would still be with us, for Karma cannot be blotted out, but the poor would know how to accept their lot and the rich how to improve the poor; now, on the contrary,

the rich wonder why the poor do not go to the poorhouse, meanwhile seeking in the laws for cures for strikes and socialism, and the poor continually growl at fate and their supposed oppressors. All this is of the quality of spiritual darkness.

Student.—Is it wise to inquire as to the periods when the cycle changes, and to speculate on the great astronomical or other changes that herald a turn?

Sage.—It is not. There is an old saying that the gods are jealous about these things, not wishing mortals to know them. We may analyse the age, but it is better not to attempt to fix the hour of a change of cycle. Besides that, you will be unable to settle it, because a cycle does not begin on a day or year clear of any other cycle; they inter-blend, so that, although the wheel of one period is still turning, the initial point of another has already arrived.

Student.—Are these some of the reasons why Mr. Sinnett was not given certain definite periods of years about which he asked?

Sage.—Yes

Student.—Has the age in which one lives any effect on the student; and what is it?

Sage.—It has effect on everyone, but the student after passing along in his development feels the effect more than the ordinary man. Were it otherwise, the sincere and aspiring students all over the world would advance at once to those heights towards which they strive. It takes a very strong soul to hold hack the age's heavy hand, and it is all the more difficult because that influence, being a part of the student's larger life, is not so well understood by him. It operates in the same way as a structural defect in a vessel. All the inner as well as the outer fibre of the man is the result of the long centuries of earthly lives lived here by his ancestors. These sow seeds of thought and physical tendencies in a way that you cannot comprehend. All those tendencies affect him. Many powers once possessed are hidden so deep as to be unseen, and he struggles against obstacles constructed ages

ago. Further yet are the peculiar alterations brought about in the astral world. It, being at once a photographic plate, so to say, and also a

reflector, has become the keeper of the mistakes of ages past which it continually reflects upon us from a plane to which most of us are strangers. In that sense therefore, free as we suppose ourselves, we are walking about completely hypnotized by the past, acting blindly under the suggestions thus cast upon us.

Student.—Was that why Jesus said, “Father, forgive them, *for they know not what they do*”?

Sage.—That was one meaning. In one aspect they acted blindly, impelled by the age, thinking they were right.

Regarding these astral alterations, you will remember how in the time of Julian the seers reported that they could see the gods, but they were decaying, some headless, others flaccid, others minus limbs, and all appearing weak. The reverence for these ideals was departing, and their astral pictures had already begun to fade.

Student.—What mitigation is there about this age? Is there nothing at all to relieve the picture?

Sage.—There *is* one thing peculiar to the present *Kali-Yuga* that may be used by the Student. All causes now bring about their effects much more rapidly than in any other or better age. A sincere lover of the race can accomplish more in three incarnations under *Kali-Yuga*'s reign than he could in a much greater number in any other age. Thus by bearing all the manifold troubles of this Age and steadily triumphing, the object of his efforts will be more quickly realized, for, while the obstacles seem great, the powers to be invoked can be reached more quickly.

Student.—Even if this is, spiritually considered, a Dark Age, is it not in part redeemed by the increasing triumphs of mind over matter, and by the effects of science in mitigating human ills, such as the causes of disease, disease itself, cruelty, intolerance, bad laws, etc.?

Sage.—Yes, these are mitigations of the darkness in just the same way that a lamp gives some light at night but does not restore daylight. In this age there are great triumphs of science, but they are nearly all directed to *effects* and do not take away the *causes* of the evils. Great

strides have been made in the arts and in cure of diseases, but in the future, as the flower of our civilization unfolds, new diseases will arise and more strange disorders will be known, springing from causes that lie deep in the minds of men and which can only be eradicated

by spiritual living.

Student.—Admitting all you say, are not we, as Theosophists, to welcome every discovery of truth in any field, especially such truth as lessens suffering or enlarges the moral sense?

Sage.—That is our duty. All truths discovered must be parts of the one Absolute Truth, and so much added to the sum of our outer knowledge. There will always be a large number of men who seek for these parts of truth, and others who try to alleviate present human misery. They each do a great and appointed work that no true Theosophist should ignore. And it is also the duty of the latter to make similar efforts when possible, for Theosophy is a dead thing if it is not turned into the life. At the same time, no one of us may be the judge of just how much or how little our brother is doing in that direction. If he does all that he can and knows how to do, he does his whole present duty.

Student.—I fear that a hostile attitude by Occult teachers towards the learning and philanthropy of the time may arouse prejudice against Theosophy and Occultism, and needlessly impede the spread of Truth. May it not be so?

Sage.—The real Occult Teachers have no hostile attitude towards these things. If some persons, who like theosophy and try to spread it, take such a position, they do not thereby alter the one assumed by the real Teachers who work with all classes of men and use every possible instrument for good. But at the same time we have found that an excess of the technical and special knowledge of the day very often acts to prevent men from apprehending the truth.

Student.—Are there any causes, other than the spread of Theosophy, which may operate to reverse the present drift towards materialism?

Sage.—The spread of the knowledge of the laws of Karma and Reincarnation and of a belief in the absolute

spiritual unity of all beings will alone prevent this drift. The cycle must, however, run its course, and until that is ended all beneficial causes will of necessity act slowly and not to the extent they would in a brighter age. As each student *lives* a better life and by his example imprints upon the astral light the picture of a higher aspiration acted in the world, he *thus aids souls of advanced development to descend from other spheres* where the cycles are so dark that they can no longer stay there.

Student.—Accept my thanks for your instruction.

Sage.—May you reach the terrace of enlightenment.

ELEMENTALS AND ELEMENTARIES

Student.—If I understand you, an elemental is a centre of force, without intelligence,

without moral character or tendencies, but capable of being directed in its movements by human thoughts, which may, consciously or not, give it any form, and to a certain extent intelligence; in its simplest form it is visible as a disturbance in a transparent medium, such as would be produced by “a glass fish, so transparent as to be invisible, swimming through the air of the room,” and leaving behind him a shimmer, such as hot air makes when rising from a stove. Also, elementals, attracted and vitalized by certain thoughts, may effect a lodgment in the human system (of which they then share the government with the ego), and are very hard to get out.

Sage.—Correct, in general, except as to their “effecting a lodgment.” Some classes of elementals, however, have an intelligence of their own and a character, but they are far beyond our comprehension and ought perhaps to have some other name.

That class which has most to do with us answers the above description. They are centres of force or energy which are acted on by us while thinking and in other bodily motions. We also act on them and give them form by a species of thought which we have no register of. As,

one person might shape an elemental so as to seem like an insect, and not be able to tell whether he had thought of such a thing or not. For there is a vast unknown country in each human being which he does not himself understand until he has tried, and then only after many initiations.

That “elementals may effect a lodgment in the human system, of which they then share the government, and are very hard to get out” is, as a whole, incorrect. It is only in certain cases that any one or more elementals are attracted to and “find lodgment in the human system.” In such cases special rules apply. We are not considering such cases. The elemental world interpenetrates this, and is therefore eternally present in the human system.

As it (the elemental world) is automatic and like a photographic plate, all atoms continually arriving at and departing from the “human system” are constantly assuming the impression conveyed by the acts and thoughts of that person, and therefore, if he sets up a strong current of thought, he attracts elementals in greater numbers, and they all take on one prevailing tendency or colour, so that all new arrivals find a homogeneous colour or image which they instantly assume. On the other hand, a man who has many diversities of thought and meditation is not homogeneous, but, so to say, parti-coloured, and so the elementals may lodge in that part which is different from the rest and go away in like condition. In the first case it is one mass of elementals similarly vibrating or electrified and coloured, and in that sense may be called one elemental in just the same way that we know one man as Jones, although for years he has been giving off and taking on new atoms of gross matter.

Student.—If they are attracted and repelled by thoughts, do they move with the velocity of thought, say from here to the planet Neptune?

Sage.—They move with the velocity of thought. In their world there is no space or time as we understand those terms. If Neptune be within the astral sphere of this world, then they go there with that velocity, otherwise not; but that “if” need not be solved now

Student.—What determines their movements besides thought,—*e.g.* when they are floating about the room.

Sage.—Those other classes of thoughts above referred to; certain exhalations of beings; different rates and ratios of vibration among beings; different changes of magnetism caused by present causes or by the moon and the year; different polarities; changes of sound; changes of influences from other minds at a distance.

Student.—When so floating, can they be seen by anyone, or only by those persons who are clairvoyant?

Sage.—Clairvoyance is a poor word. They can be seen by partly clairvoyant people. By all those who can see thus; by more people, perhaps, than are aware of the fact.

Student.—Can they be photographed, as the rising air from the hot stove can?

Sage.—Not to my knowledge yet. It is not impossible, however.

Student.—Are they the lights, seen floating about a dark séance room by clairvoyant people?

Sage.—In the majority of cases those lights are produced by them.

Student.—Exactly what is their relation to light, that makes it necessary to hold séances in the dark?

Sage.—It is not *their* relation to light that makes darkness necessary, but the fact that light causes constant agitation and alteration in the magnetism of the room. All these things can be done just as well in the light of day.

If I should be able to make clear to you “exactly what is their relation to light,” then you would know what has long been kept secret, the key to the elemental world. This is kept guarded because it is a dangerous secret. No matter how virtuous you are, you could not—once you knew the secret—prevent the knowledge getting out into the minds of others who would not hesitate to use it for bad purposes.

Student.—I have noticed that attention often interferes with certain phenomena; thus a pencil will not write when watched, but writes at once when covered; or a mental question cannot be answered till the mind has left it and gone to something else. Why is this?

Sage.—This kind of attention creates confusion. In these things we use desire, will, and knowledge. The desire is present, but knowledge is absent. When the desire is well formed

and attention withdrawn, the thing is often done; but when our attention is continued we only interrupt, because we possess only half attention. In order to use attention, it must be of that sort which can hold itself to the point of a needle for an indefinite period of time.

Student.—I have been told that but few people can go to a séance without danger to themselves, either of some spiritual or astral contamination, or of having their vitality depleted for the benefit of the spooks, who suck the vital force out of the circle through the medium, as if the former were a glass of lemonade and the latter a straw. How is this?

Sage.—Quite generally this happens. It is called Bhut worship by the Hindus.

Student.—Why are visitors at a séance often extremely and unaccountably tired next day?

Sage.—Among other reasons, because mediums absorb the vitality for the use of the “spooks,” and often vile vampire elementaries are present.

Student.—What are some of the dangers at séances?

Sage.—The scenes visible—in the Astral—at séances are horrible, inasmuch as these “spirits”—bhuts—precipitate themselves upon sitters and mediums alike; and as there is no séance without having present some or many bad elementaries—half dead human beings,—there is much vampirising going on. These things fall upon the people like a cloud or a big octopus, and disappear within them as if sucked in by a sponge. That is one reason why it is not well to attend them in general.

Elementaries are not all bad, but, in a general sense, they are not good. They are shells, no doubt of that. Well, they have much automatic and seemingly intelligent action left if they are those of strongly material people who died attached to the things of life. If of people of an opposite character, they are not so strong. Then there is a class which are really not dead, such as suicides, and

sudden deaths, and highly wicked people. They are powerful. Elementals enter into all of them, and thus get a fictitious personality and intelligence wholly the property of the shell. They galvanize the shell into action, and by its means can see and hear as if beings themselves, like us. The shells are, in this case, just like a sleep-walking human body. They will through habit exhibit the advancement they got while in the flesh. Some people you know, do not impart to their bodily molecules the habit of their minds to as great [an] extent as others. We thus see why the utterances of these so-called “spirits” are never ahead of the highest point of progress attained by living human beings, and why they take up the ideas elaborated day-by-day by their votaries. This séance worship is what was called in Old India the worship of the Pretas and Bhuts and Pisachas and Ghandarvas.

I do not think any elementary capable of motive had ever any other than a bad one; the rest are nothing, they have no motive and are only the shades refused passage by Charon.

Student.—What is the relation between sexual force and phenomena?

Sage.—It is at the bottom. This force is vital, creative, and a sort of reservoir. It may be lost by mental action as well as by physical. In fact its finer part is dissipated by mental

imaginings, while physical acts only draw off the gross part, that which is the “carrier” (upadhi) for the finer.

Student.—Why do so many mediums cheat, even when they can produce real phenomena?

Sage.—It is the effect of the use of that which in itself is sublimated cheating, which, acting on an irresponsible mind, causes the lower form of cheat, of which the higher is any illusionary form whatever. Besides, a medium is of necessity unbalanced somewhere.

They deal with these forces for pay, and that is enough to call to them all the wickedness of time. They use the really gross sorts of matter, which causes inflammation in corresponding portions of the moral character, and hence divagations from the path of honesty. It is a great temptation. You do not know, either, what fierceness there is

in those who “have paid” for a sitting and wish “for the worth of their money.”

Student.—When a clairvoyant, as a man did here a year ago, tells me that, “he sees a strong band of spirits about me,” and among them an old man who says he is a certain eminent character, what does he really see? Empty and senseless shells? If so, what brought them there? Or elementals which have got their form from my mind or his?

Sage.—Shells, I think, and thoughts, and old astral pictures. If, for instance, you once saw that eminent person and conceived great respect or fear for him, so that his image was graven in your astral sphere in deeper lines than other images, it would be seen for your whole life by seers, who, if untrained,—as they all are here,—could not tell whether it was an image or reality; and then each sight of it is a revivification of the image.

Besides, not all would see the same thing. Fall down, for instance, and hurt your body, and that will bring up all similar events and old forgotten things before any seer’s eye.

The whole astral world is a mass of illusion; people see into it, and then, through the novelty of the thing and the exclusiveness of the power, they are bewildered into thinking they actually see true things, whereas they have only removed one thin crust of dirt.

Student.—Accept my thanks for your instruction

Sage.—May you reach the terrace of enlightenment.

ELEMENTALS—KARMA

Student.—Permit me to ask you again, are elementals beings?

Sage.—It is not easy to convey to you an idea of the constitution of elementals; strictly speaking, they are not, because the word *elementals* has been used in reference to a class of them that have no being such as mortals have. It would be better to adopt the terms used in Indian books, such as Ghandarvas, Bhuts, Pisachas, Devas, and so on.

Many things well known about them cannot be put into ordinary language.

Student.—Do you refer to their being able to act in the fourth dimension of space?

Sage.—Yes, in a measure. Take the tying in an endless cord of many knots,—a thing often done at spiritist séances. That is possible to him who knows more dimensions of space than three. No three-dimensional being can do this; and as you understand “matter,” it is impossible for you to conceive how such a knot can be tied or how a solid ring can be passed through the matter of another solid one. These things can be done by elementals.

Student.—Are they not all of one class?

Sage.—No. There are different classes for each plane, and division of plane, of nature. Many can never be recognized by men. And those pertaining to our plane do not act in another. You must remember, too, that these “planes” of which we are speaking interpenetrate each other.

Student.—Am I to understand that a clairvoyant or clairaudient has to do with or is affected by a certain special class or classes of elementals?

Sage.—Yes. A clairvoyant can only see the sights properly belonging to the planes his development reaches to or has opened. And the elementals in those planes show to the clairvoyant only such pictures as belong to their plane. Other parts of the idea or thing pictured may be retained in planes not yet open to the seer. For this reason few clairvoyants know the whole truth.

Student.—Is there not some connection between the Karma of man and elementals?

Sage.—A very important one. The elemental world has become a strong factor in the Karma of the human race. Being unconscious, automatic, and photographic, it assumes the complexion of the human family itself. In the earlier ages, when we may postulate that man had not yet begun to make bad Karma, the elemental world was more friendly to man because it had not received unfriendly impressions. But so soon as man began to become ignorant, unfriendly to himself and the rest of creation,

the elemental world began to take on exactly the same complexion and return to humanity the exact pay, so to speak, due for the actions of humanity. Or, like a donkey, which, when he is pushed against, will push against you. Or, as a human being, when anger or insult is offered, feels inclined to return the same. So the elemental world, being unconscious force, returns or reacts upon humanity exactly as humanity acted towards it, whether the actions of men were done with the knowledge of these laws or not. So in these times it has come to be that the elemental world has the complexion and action which is the exact result of all the actions and thoughts and desires of men from the earliest times. And, being unconscious and only acting according to the natural laws of its being, the elemental world

is a powerful factor in the workings of Karma. And so long as mankind does not cultivate brotherly feeling and charity towards the whole of creation, just so long will the elementals be without the impulse to act for our benefit. But so soon and wherever man or men begin to cultivate brotherly feeling and love for the whole of creation, there and then the elementals begin to take on the new condition.

Student.—How then about the doing of phenomena by adepts?

Sage.—The production of phenomena is not possible without either the aid or disturbance of elementals. Each phenomenon entails the expenditure of great force, and also brings on a correspondingly great disturbance in the elemental world, which disturbance is beyond the limit natural to ordinary human life. It then follows that, as soon as the phenomenon is completed, the disturbance occasioned begins to be compensated for. The elementals are in greatly excited motion, and precipitate themselves in various directions. They are not able to affect those who are protected. But they are able, or rather it is possible for them, to enter into the sphere of unprotected persons, and especially those persons who are engaged in the study of occultism. And then they become agents in concentrating the karma of those persons, producing troubles and disasters often, or other difficulties which otherwise might have

been so spread over a period of time as to be not counted more than the ordinary vicissitudes of life. This will go to explain the meaning of the statement that an Adept will not do a phenomenon unless he sees the desire in the mind of another lower or higher Adept or student; for then there is a sympathetic relation established, and also a tacit acceptance of the consequences which may ensue. It will also help to understand the peculiar reluctance often of some persons, who can perform phenomena, to produce them in cases where we may think their production would be beneficial; and also why they are never done in order to compass worldly ends, as is natural for worldly people to suppose might be done,—such as procuring money, transferring objects, influencing minds, and so on.

Student.—Accept my thanks for your instruction.

Sage.—May you reach the terrace of enlightenment!

Student.—Is there any reason why you do not give me a more detailed explanation of the constitution of elementals and the modes by which they work?

Sage.—Yes. There are many reasons. Among others is your inability, shared by most of the people of the present day, to comprehend a description of things that pertain to a world with which you are not familiar and for which you do not yet possess terms of expression. Were I to put forth these descriptions, the greater part would seem vague and incomprehensible on one hand, while on the other many of them would mislead you

because of the interpretation put on them by yourself. Another reason is that, if the constitution, field of action, and method of action of elementals were given out, there are some minds of a very inquiring and peculiar bent who soon could find out how to come into communication with these extraordinary beings, with results disadvantageous to the community as well as the individuals.

Student.—Why so? Is it not well to increase the sum of human knowledge, even respecting most recondite parts of nature; or can it be that the elementals are bad?

Sage.—It is wise to increase the knowledge of nature's laws, but always with proper limitations. All things will become known some day. Nothing can be kept back when men have reached the point where they can understand. But at this time it would not be wise to give them, for the asking, certain knowledge that would not be good for them. That knowledge relates to elementals, and it can for the present be kept back from the scientists of today. So long as it can be retained from them, it will be, until they and their followers are of a different stamp.

As to the moral character of elementals, they have none: they are colourless in themselves—except some classes—and merely assume the tint, so to speak, of the person using them.

Student.—Will our scientific men one day, then, be able to use these beings, and, if so, what will be the manner of it? Will their use be confined to only the good men of the earth?

Sage.—The hour is approaching when all this will be done. But the scientists of to-day are not the men to get this knowledge. They are only pigmy forerunners who sow seed and delve blindly in no thoroughfares. They are too small to be able to grasp these mighty powers, but they are not wise enough to see that their methods will eventually lead to Black Magic in centuries to come when they shall be forgotten.

When elemental forces are used similarly as we now see electricity and other natural energies adapted to various purposes, there will be "war in heaven." Good men will not alone possess the ability to use them. Indeed, the sort of man you now call "good" will not be the most able. The wicked will, however, pay liberally for the power of those who can wield such forces, and at last the Supreme Masters, who now guard this knowledge from children, will have to come forth. Then will ensue a dreadful war, in which, as has ever happened, the Masters will succeed and the evil doers be destroyed by the very engines, principalities, and powers prostituted to their own purposes during years of intense selfish living. But why dilate on this; in these days it is only a prophecy.

Student.—Could you give me some hints as to how the secrets of the elemental plane are preserved and prevented from being known? Do these guardians of whom you speak occupy themselves in checking elementals, or how? Do they see much danger of divulgement likely in those instances where elemental action is patent to the observer?

Sage.—As to whether they check elementals or not need not be inquired into, because, while that may be probable, it does not appear very necessary where men are unsuspecting of the agency causing the phenomena. It is much easier to throw a cloud over the investigator's mind and lead him off to other results of often material advantage to himself and men, while at the same time acting as a complete preventive or switch which turns his energies and application into different departments.

It might be illustrated thus: Suppose that a number of trained occultists are set apart to watch the various sections of the world where the mental energies are in fervid operation. It is quite easy for them to see in a moment any mind that is about reaching a clue into the elemental world; and, besides, imagine that trained elementals themselves constantly carry information of such events. Then, by superior knowledge and command over this peculiar world, influences presenting various pictures are sent out to that inquiring mind. In one case it may be a new moral reform, in another a great invention is revealed, and such is the effect that the man's whole time and mind are taken up by this new thing which he fondly imagines is his own. Or, again, it would be easy to turn his thoughts into a certain rut leading far from the dangerous clue. In fact, the methods are endless.

Student.—Would it be wise to put into the hands of truly good, conscientious men who now use aright what gifts they have, knowledge of and control over elementals, to be used on the side of right?

Sage.—The Masters are the judges of what good men are to have this power and control. You must not forget that you cannot be sure of the character at bottom of those whom you call "truly good and conscientious men." Place them in the fire of the tremendous

temptation which such power and control would furnish, and most of them would fail. But the Masters already know the characters of all who in any way approach to a knowledge of these forces, and They always judge whether such a man is to be aided or prevented. They are not working to make these laws and forces known, but to establish right doctrine, speech, and action, so that the characters and motives of men shall undergo such radical changes as to fit them for wielding power in the elemental world. And that power is not now lying idle, as you infer, but is being always used by those who will never fail to rightly use it.

Student.—Is there any illustration at hand showing what the people of the present day would do with these extraordinary energies?

Sage.—A cursory glance at men in these western worlds engaged in the mad rush after

money, many of them willing to do anything to get it, and at the strain, almost to warfare, existing between labourers and users of labour, must show you that, were either class in possession of power over the elemental world, they would direct it to the furtherance of the aims now before them. Then look at Spiritualism. It is recorded in the Lodge—photographed, you may say, by the doers of the acts themselves—that an enormous number of persons daily seek the aid of mediums and their “spooks” merely on questions of business. Whether to buy stocks, or engage in mining for gold and silver, to deal in lotteries, or to make new mercantile contracts. Here on one side is a picture of a coterie of men who obtained at a low figure some mining property on the advice of elemental spirits with fictitious names masquerading behind mediums; these mines were then to be put upon the public at a high profit, inasmuch as the “spirits” promised metal. Unhappily for the investors, it failed. But such a record is repeated in many cases.

Then here is another where in a great American city—the Karma being favourable—a certain man speculated in stocks upon similar advice, succeeded, and, after giving the medium liberal pay, retired to what is called

enjoyment of life. Neither party devoted either himself or the money to the benefiting of humanity.

There is no question of honour involved, nor any as to whether money ought or ought not to be made. It is solely one as to the propriety, expediency, and results of giving suddenly into the hands of a community unprepared and without an altruistic aim, such abnormal power. Take hidden treasure, for instance. There is much of it in hidden places, and many men wish to get it. For what purpose? For the sake of ministering to their luxurious wants and leaving it to their equally unworthy descendants. Could they know the mantram controlling the elementals that guard such treasure, they would use it at once, motive or no motive, the sole object being the money in the case.

Student.—Do some sorts of elementals have guard over hidden treasure?

Sage.—Yes, in every instance, whether never found or soon discovered. The causes for the hiding and the thoughts of the hider or loser have much to do with the permanent concealment or subsequent finding.

Student.—What happens when a large sum of money, say, such as Captain Kidd’s mythical treasure, is concealed, or when a quantity of coin is lost?

Sage.—Elementals gather about it. They have many and curious modes of causing further concealment. They even influence animals to that end. This class of elementals seldom, if ever, report at your spiritualistic séances. As time goes on the forces of air and water still further aid them, and sometimes they are able even to prevent the hider from recovering it. Thus in course of years, even when they may have altogether lost their hold on it, the whole thing becomes shrouded in mist, and it is impossible to find anything.

Student.—This in part explains why so many failures are recorded in the search for hidden treasure. But how about the Masters; are they prevented thus by these weird

guardians?

Sage.—They are not. The vast quantities of gold hidden in the earth and under the sea are at their disposal

always. They can, when necessary for their purposes, obtain such sums of money on whom no living being or descendants of any have the slightest claim, as would appal the senses of your greatest money getter. They have but to command the very elementals controlling it, and They have it. This is the basis for the story of Aladdin's wonderful lamp, more true than you believe.

Student.—Of what use then is it to try, like the alchemists, to make gold? With the immense amount of buried treasure thus easily found when you control its guardian, it would seem a waste of time and money to learn transmutation of metals.

Sage.—The transmutation spoken of by the real alchemists was the alteration of the base alloy in man's nature. At the same time, actual transmutation of lead into gold is possible. And many followers of the alchemists, as well as of the pure-souled Jacob Boehme, eagerly sought to accomplish the material transmuting, being led away by the glitter of wealth. But an Adept has no need for transmutation, as I have shown you. The stories told of various men who are said to have produced gold from base metals for different kings in Europe are wrong explanations. Here and there Adepts have appeared, assuming different names, and in certain emergencies they supplied or used large sums of money. But instead of its being the product of alchemical art, it was simply ancient treasure brought to them by elementals in their service and that of the Lodge. Raymond Lully or Robert Flood might have been of that sort, but I forbear to say, since I cannot claim acquaintance with those men.

Student.—I thank you for your instruction.

Sage.—May you reach the terrace of enlightenment!

MANTRAMS

Student.—You spoke of mantrams by which we could control elementals on guard over hidden treasure. What is a mantram?

Sage.—A mantram is a collection of words which, when sounded in speech, induce

certain vibrations not only in the air, but also in the finer ether, thereby producing certain effects.

Student.—Are the words taken at haphazard?

Sage.—Only by those who, knowing nothing of mantrams, yet use them.

Student.—May they, then, be used according to rule and also irregularly? Can it be possible that people who know absolutely nothing of their existence or field of operations should at the same time make use of them? Or is it something like digestion, of which so many people know nothing whatever, while they in fact are dependent upon its proper use for their existence? I crave your indulgence because I know nothing of the subject.

Sage.—The “common people” in almost every country make use of them continually, but even in that case the principle at the bottom is the same as in the other. In a new country where folklore has not yet had time to spring up, the people do not have as many as in such a land as India or in long settled parts of Europe. The aborigines, however, in any country will be possessed of them.

Student.—You do not now infer that they are used by Europeans for the controlling of elementals.

Sage.—No. I refer to their effect in ordinary intercourse between human beings. And yet there are many men in Europe, as well as in Asia, who can thus control animals, but those are nearly always special cases. There are men in Germany, Austria, Italy, and Ireland who can bring about extraordinary effects on horses, cattle, and the like, by peculiar sounds uttered in a certain way. In those instances the sound used is a mantram of only one member, and will act only on the particular animal that the user knows it can rule.

Student.—Do these men know the rules governing the matter? Are they able to convey it to another?

Sage.—Generally not. It is a gift self-found or inherited, and they only know that it can be done by them, just as a mesmeriser knows he can do a certain thing with a wave of his hand, but is totally ignorant of the principle. They

are as ignorant of the base of this strange effect as your modern physiologists are of the function and cause of such a common thing as yawning.

Student.—Under what head should we put this unconscious exercise of power?

Sage.—Under the head of natural magic, that materialistic science can never crush out. It is a touch with nature and her laws always preserved by the masses, who, while they form the majority of the population, are yet ignored by the “cultured classes.” And so it will be discovered by you that it is not in London or Paris or New York drawing-rooms that you will find mantrams, whether regular or irregular, used by the people. “Society,” too cultured to be natural, has adopted methods of speech intended to conceal and to deceive, so that natural mantrams cannot be studied within its borders.

Single, natural mantrams are such words as “wife.” When it is spoken it brings up in the mind all that is implied by the word. And if in another language, the word would be

that corresponding to the same basic idea. And so with expressions of greater length, such as many slang sentences; thus, "I want to see the colour of his money." There are also sentences applicable to certain individuals, the use of which involves a knowledge of the character of those to whom we speak. When these are used, a peculiar and lasting vibration is set up in the mind of the person affected, leading to a realization in action of the idea involved, or to a total change of life due to the appositeness of the subjects brought up and to the peculiar mental antithesis induced in the hearer. As soon as the effect begins to appear the mantram may be forgotten, since the *law of habit* then has sway in the brain.

Again, bodies of men are acted on by expressions having the mantram quality; this is observed in great social or other disturbances. The reason is the same as before. A dominant idea is aroused that touches upon a want of the people or on an abuse which oppresses them, and the change and interchange in their brains between the idea

and the form of words go on until the result is accomplished. To the occultist of powerful sight this is seen to be a "ringing" of the words coupled with the whole chain of feelings, interests, aspirations, and so forth, that grows faster and deeper as the time for the relief or change draws near. And the greater number of persons affected by the idea involved, the larger, deeper, and wider the result. A mild illustration may be found in Lord Beaconsfield of England. He knew about mantrams, and continually invented phrases of that quality. "Peace with honour" was one; "a scientific frontier" was another; and his last, intended to have a wider reach, but which death prevented his supplementing, was "Empress of India." King Henry of England also tried it without himself knowing why, when he added to his titles, "Defender of the Faith." With these hints numerous illustrations will occur to you.

Student.—These mantrams have only to do with human beings as between each other. They do not affect elementals, as I judge from what you say. And they are not dependent upon the *sound* so much as upon words bringing up ideas. Am I right in this; and is it the case that there is a field in which certain vocalizations produce effects in the *Akasa* by means of which men, animals, and elementals alike can be influenced, without regard to their knowledge of any known language?

Sage.—You are right. We have only spoken of natural, unconsciously-used mantrams. The scientific mantrams belong to the class you last referred to. It is to be doubted whether they can be found in modern Western languages,—especially among English speaking people who are continually changing and adding to their spoken words to such an extent that the English of to-day could hardly be understood by Chaucer's predecessors. It is in the ancient Sanskrit and the language which preceded it that mantrams are hidden. The laws governing their use are also to be found in those languages, and not in any modern philological store.

Student.—Suppose, though, that one acquires a knowledge of ancient and correct mantrams, could he affect a

person speaking English, and by the use of English words?

Sage.—He could; and all adepts have the power to translate a strictly regular mantram into any form of language, so that a single sentence thus uttered by them will have an immense effect on the person addressed, whether it be by letter or word of mouth.

Student.—Is there no way in which we might, as it were imitate those adepts in this?

Sage.—Yes, you should study simple forms of mantramic quality, for the purpose of thus reaching the hidden mind of all the people who need spiritual help. You will find now and then some expression that has resounded in the brain, at last producing such a result that he who heard it turns his mind to spiritual things.

Student.—I thank you for your instruction.

Sage.—May the Brahmamantram guide you to the everlasting truth.—OM.

Student.—A materialist stated to me as his opinion that all that is said about mantrams is mere sentimental theorizing, and while it may be true that certain words affect people, the sole reason is that they embody ideas distasteful or pleasant to the hearers, but that the mere sounds, as such, have no effect whatever, and as to either words or sounds affecting animals he denied it altogether. Of course he would not take elementals into account at all, as their existence is impossible for him.

Sage.—This position is quite natural in these days. There has been so much materialization of thought, and the real scientific attitude of leading minds in different branches of investigation has been so greatly misunderstood by those who think they follow the example of the scientific men, that most people in the West are afraid to admit anything beyond what may be apprehended by the five senses. The man you speak of is one of that always numerous class who adopt as fixed and unalterable general laws laid down from time to time by well-known *savants*,

forgetting that the latter constantly change and advance from point to point.

Student.—Do you think, then, that the scientific world will one day admit much that is known to Occultists?

Sage.—Yes, it will. The genuine Scientist is always in that attitude which permits him to admit things proven. He may seem to you often to be obstinate and blind, but in fact he is proceeding slowly to the truth,—too slowly, perhaps, for you, yet not in the position of knowing all. It is the venerated scientist who swears by the published results of the work of leading men as being the last word, while, at the very moment he is doing so, his authority

may have made notes or prepared new theories tending to greatly broaden and advance the last utterance. It is only when the dogmatism of a priest backed up by law declares that a discovery is opposed to the revealed word of his god, that we may fear. That day is gone for a long time to come, and we need expect no more scenes like that in which Galileo took part. But among the materialistic minds to whom you referred, there is a good deal of that old spirit left, only that the “revealed word of God “ has become the utterances of our scientific leaders.

Student.—I have observed that within even the last quarter of a century. About ten years ago many well-known men laughed to scorn any one who admitted the facts within the experience of every mesmeriser, while now, under the term “hypnotism,” they are nearly all admitted. And when these lights of our time were denying it all, the French doctors were collating the results of a long series of experiments. It seems as if the invention of a new term for an old and much abused one furnished an excuse for granting all that had been previously denied. But have you anything to say about those materialistic investigators? Are they not governed by some powerful, though unperceived, law?

Sage.—They are. They are in the forefront of the mental, but not of the spiritual, progress of the time, and are driven forward by forces they know nothing of. Help is very often given to them by the Masters, who, neglecting

nothing, constantly see to it that these men make progress upon the fittest lines for them, just as you are assisted not only in your spiritual life but in your mental also. These men, therefore, will go on admitting facts and finding new laws or new names for old laws, to explain them. They cannot help it.

Student.—What should be our duty, then, as students of truth? Should we go out as reformers of science, or what?

Sage.—You ought not to take up the role of reformers of the schools and their masters, because success would not attend the effort. Science is competent to take care of itself, and you would only be throwing pearls before them to be trampled under foot. Rest content that all within their comprehension will be discovered and admitted from time to time. The endeavour to force them into admitting what you believe to be so plain would be due almost solely to your vanity and love of praise. It is not possible to force them, any more than it is for me to force you, to admit certain incomprehensible laws, and you would not think me wise or fair to first open before you things, to understand which you have not the necessary development, and then to force you into admitting their truth. Or if, out of reverence, you should say “These things are true,” while you comprehended nothing and were not progressing, you would have bowed to superior force.

Student.—But you do not mean that we should remain ignorant of science and devote ourselves only to ethics?

Sage.—Not at all. Know all that you can. Become conversant with and sift all that the schools have declared, and as much more on your own account as is possible, but at the

same time teach, preach, and practice a life based on a true understanding of brotherhood. This is the true way. The common people, those who know no science, are the greatest number. They must be so taught that the discoveries of science which are unilluminated by spirit may not be turned into Black Magic.

Student.—In our last conversation you touched upon the guarding of buried treasure by elementals. I should like

very much to hear a little more about that. Not about how to control them or to procure the treasure, but upon the subject generally.

Sage.—The laws governing the hiding of buried treasure are the same as those that relate to lost objects. Every person has about him a fluid, or plane, or sphere, or energy, whichever you please to call it, in which are constantly found elementals that partake of his nature. That is, they are tinted with his colour and impressed by his character. There are numerous classes of these. Some men have many of one class or of all, or many of some and few of others. And anything worn upon your person is connected with your elementals. For instance, you wear cloth made of wool or linen, and little objects made of wood, bone, brass, gold, silver, and other substances. Each one of these has certain magnetic relations peculiar to itself, and all of them are soaked, to a greater or less extent, with your magnetism as well as nervous fluid. Some of them, because of their substance, do not long retain this fluid, while others do. The elementals are connected, each class according to its substance, with those objects by means of the magnetic fluid. And they are acted upon by the mind and desires to a greater extent than you know, and in a way that cannot be formulated in English. Your desires have a powerful grasp, so to say, upon certain things, and upon others a weaker hold. When one of these objects is suddenly dropped, it is invariably followed by elementals. They are drawn after it, and may be said to go with the object by attraction rather than by sight. In many cases they completely envelop the thing, so that, although it is near at hand, it cannot be seen by the eye. But after a while the magnetism wears off and their power to envelop the article weakens, whereupon it appears in sight. This does not happen in every case. But it is a daily occurrence, and is sufficiently obvious to many persons to be quite removed from the realm of fable. I think, indeed, that one of your literary persons has written an essay upon this very experience, in which, although treated in a comic vein, many truths are unconsciously told; the title of this

was, if I mistake not, “Upon the Innate Perversity of Inanimate Objects.” There is such a nice balancing of forces in these cases that you must be careful in your generalizations.

You may justly ask, for instance, why, when a coat is dropped, it seldom disappears from sight? Well, there are cases in which even such a large object is hidden, but they are not very common. The coat is full of your magnetism, and the elementals may feel in it just as much of you as when it is on your back. There may be, for them, no disturbance of the relations, magnetic and otherwise. And often in the case of a small object not invisible, the balancing of forces, due to many causes that have to do with your condition at the time prevents the hiding. To decide in any particular case, one would have to see into the realm where the operation of these laws is hidden, and calculate all the forces, so as to say why it happened in one way and not in another.

Student.—But take the case of a man who, being in possession of treasure, hides it in the earth and goes away and dies, and it is not found. In that instance the elementals did not hide it. Or when a miser buries his gold or jewels. How about those?

Sage.—In all cases where a man buries gold, or jewels, or money, or precious things, his desires are fastened to that which he hides. Many of his elementals attach themselves to it, and other classes of them also, who had nothing to do with him, gather round and keep it hidden. In the case of the captain of a ship containing treasure the influences are very powerful, because there the elementals are gathered from all the persons connected with the treasure, and the officer himself is full of solicitude for what is committed to his charge. You should also remember that gold and silver—or metals—have relations with elementals that are of a strong and peculiar character. They do not work for human law, and natural law does not assign any property in metals to man, nor recognize in him any peculiar and transcendent right to retain what he has dug from the earth or acquired to himself. Hence we do not find the elementals anxious to restore to him the gold or silver which he had lost. If

we were to assume that they occupied themselves in catering to the desires of men or in establishing what we call our rights over property, we might as well at once grant the existence of a capricious and irresponsible Providence. They proceed solely according to the law of their being, and, as they are without the power of making a judgment, they commit no blunders and are not to be moved by considerations based upon our vested rights or our unsatisfied wishes. Therefore, the spirits that appertain to metals invariably act as the laws of their nature prescribe, and one way of doing so is to obscure the metals from our sight.

Student.—Can you make any application of all this in the realm of ethics?

Sage.—There is a very important thing you should not overlook. Every time you harshly and unmercifully criticise the faults of another, you produce an attraction to yourself of certain quantities of elementals from that person. They fasten themselves upon you and endeavour to find in you a similar state or spot or fault that they have left in the other person. It is as if they left him to serve you at higher wages, so to say.

Then there is that which I referred to in a preceding conversation, about the effect of

our acts and thoughts upon, not only the portion of the astral light belonging to each of us with its elementals but upon the whole astral world. If men saw the dreadful pictures imprinted there and constantly throwing down upon us their suggestions to repeat the same acts or thoughts, a millennium might soon draw near. The astral light is, in this sense, the same as the photographer's negative plate, and we are the sensitive paper underneath, on which is being printed the picture. We can see two sorts of pictures for each act. One is the act itself, and the other is the picture of the thoughts and feelings animating those engaged in it. You can therefore see that you may be responsible for many more dreadful pictures than you had supposed. For actions of a simple outward appearance have behind them, very often, the worst of thoughts and desires.

Student.—Have these pictures in the astral light anything to do with us upon being reincarnated in subsequent earth-lives?

Sage.—They have very much indeed. We are influenced by them for vast periods of time, and in this you can perhaps find clues to many operations of active Karmic law for which you seek.

Student.—Is there not also some effect upon animals, and through them upon us, and *vice versa*?

Sage.—Yes. The animal kingdom is affected by us through the astral light. We have impressed the latter with pictures of cruelty, oppression, dominion, and slaughter. The whole Christian world admits that man can indiscriminately slaughter animals, upon the theory, elaborately set forth by priests in early times, that animals have no souls. Even little children learn this, and very early begin to kill insects, birds, and animals, not for protection, but from wantonness. As they grow up the habit is continued, and in England we see that shooting large numbers of birds beyond the wants of the table, is a national peculiarity, or, as I should say, a vice. This may be called a mild illustration. If these people could catch elementals as easily as they can animals, they would kill them for amusement when they did not want them for use; and, if the elementals refused to obey, then their death would follow as a punishment. All this is perceived by the elemental world, without conscience of course; but under the laws of action and reaction, we receive back from it exactly that which we give.

Student.—Before we leave the subject I should like to refer again to the question of metals and the relation of man to the elementals connected with the mineral world. We see some persons who seem always to be able to find metals with ease—or, as they say, who are lucky in that direction. How am I to reconcile this with the natural tendency of elementals to hide? Is it because there is a war or discord, as it were, between different classes belonging to any one person?

Sage.—That is a part of the explanation. Some persons, as I said, have more of one class attached to them

than another. A person fortunate with metals, say of gold and silver, has about him more of the elementals connected with or belonging to the kingdoms of those metals than other people, and thus there is less strife between the elementals. The preponderance of the metal-spirits makes the person more homogeneous with their kingdoms, and a natural attraction exists between the gold or silver lost or buried and that person, more than in the case of other people.

Student.—What determines this? Is it due to a desiring of gold and silver, or is it congenital?

Sage.—It is innate. The combinations in any one individual are so intricate and due to so many causes that you could not calculate them. They run back many generations, and depend upon peculiarities of soil, climate, nation, family, and race. These are, as you can see, enormously varied, and, with the materials at your command now, quite beyond your reach. Merely wishing for gold and silver will not do it.

Student.—I judge also that attempting to get at those elementals by thinking strongly will not accomplish that result either.

Sage.—No, it will not, because your thoughts do not reach them. They do not hear or see you, and, as it is only by accidental concentration of forces that unlearned people influence them, these accidents are only possible to the extent that you possess the natural leaning to the particular kingdom whose elementals you have influenced.

Student.—I thank you for your instruction.

Sage.—May you be guided to the path which leads to light!

[See Compiler's Note on page 400, in regard to Additional Material in continuation of the above Series.]



H.P. BLAVATSKY

It is likely that H.P.B. was in her late thirties or early forties when this picture was taken. No definite information about this exists. It is reproduced from an original print, by courtesy of The Theosophical Society in America, Wheaton, Ill.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

WHAT GOOD HAS THEOSOPHY DONE IN INDIA?

129

WHAT GOOD HAS THEOSOPHY DONE IN INDIA?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 8, April, 1888, pp. 85-91]

The race of mankind would perish, did they cease to aid each other. From the time that the mother binds the child's head, till the moment that some kind assistant wipes the death-damp from the brow of the dying, we cannot exist without mutual help. All, therefore, that need aid, have a right to ask it from their fellow-mortals. No one who holds the power of granting, can refuse it without guilt.

—SIR WALTER SCOTT.

Several correspondents and enquirers have lately asked us “What good have you done in India?” To answer it would be easy. One has but to ask the doubters to read the January Number, 1888, of the Madras *Theosophist*—our official organ—and, turning to the report in it on the Anniversary Meeting of the Theosophical Society, whose delegates meet yearly at Adyar, see for himself. Many and various are the good works done by the 127 active branches of the Theosophical Society scattered throughout the length and breadth of India. But as most of those works are of a moral and reformatory character, the ethical results upon the members are difficult to describe. Free Sanskrit schools have been opened wherever it was possible; gratuitous classes are held; free dispensaries—homeopathic and allopathic—established for the poor, and many of our Theosophists feed and clothe the needy.

All this, however, might have been done by people without belonging to our Brotherhood, we may be told. True; and much the same has been done before the T.S. appeared in India, and from time immemorial. Yet such work has been hitherto done, and such help given by the wealthier members of one caste or religious community exclusively to the poorer members of the same caste and religious denomination. No Brahmin would have held brotherly intercourse even with a Brahmin of another division of his own high caste, let alone with a Jain or Buddhist. A Parsee would only protect and defend his own brother-follower of Zoroaster. A Jain would feed

and take care of a lame and sick animal, but would turn away from a Hindu of the Vaishnava or any other sect. He would spend thousands on the “Hospital for Animals”

where bullocks, old crippled tigers and dogs are nursed, but would not approach a fellow-man in need unless he was a Jain like himself. But now, since the advent of the Theosophical Society, things in India are, slowly it is true, yet gradually, becoming otherwise.

We have, then, to show rather the good moral effect produced by the Society in general, and each branch of it in its own district on the population, than to boast of works of charity, for which India has ever been noted. We shall not enter even into a disquisition upon the benefits to be reaped by the establishment of a Sanskrit, or rather an Oriental and European library at Adyar, which, thanks to the indefatigable efforts of the President-Founder and his colleagues, begins now to assume quite hopeful proportions. But we will draw at once the attention of the enquirers to the ethical aspect of the question; for all the visible or objective works, whether of charity or any other kind, must pale before the results achieved through the influence of the chief universal, ethical aim and idea of our Society.

Yes; the seeds of a true *Universal Brotherhood* of man, not of brother-religionists or sectarians only, have been finally sown on the sacred soil of India! The letter that follows these lines proves it most undeniably. These seeds have been thrown since 1881 into that soil, which, for thousands of years, has stubbornly and systematically ejected everything foreign to its system of caste, and refused to assimilate any heterogeneous element alien to Brahmanism, the chief master of the soil of Aryavarta, or to accept any ideas not based upon the Laws of Manu. The Orientalist and the Anglo-Indian, who know something of that tyranny of caste which has hitherto formed an impassable barrier, an almost fathomless gulf between Brahmanism and every other religion, know also of the great hatred of the orthodox “twice born,” the *dwija* Brahmin, to the Buddhist *nastika* (the atheist, he who refuses to recognise the Brahminical gods and idols); and

they, above all others, will realize, even if they do not fully appreciate, the importance of what has now been achieved by the Theosophical Society. It took several years of incessant efforts to bring about even the beginning of a *rapprochement* between the Brahmin and Buddhist theosophists. A few years ago the President-Founder of the Society, Colonel H. S. Olcott, had almost succeeded in making a breach in the Chinese wall of Brahmanism. It was an unprecedented event; and it created a great stir among the natives, a sincere enthusiasm among the “Heathens,” and much malicious opposition, gossip, and slanderous denial from those who, above all men, ought to work for the idea of Universal Brotherhood preached by their Master—the *good* Christian Missionaries. Colonel Olcott had succeeded in arranging a kind of preliminary reconciliation between the Brahminical Theosophical Society of Tinnevely and their brother Theosophists and neighbours of Ceylon. Several Buddhists had been brought from Lanka, led by the President, carrying with them, as an emblem of peace and reconciliation, a sprout of the sacred *râja* (king) cocoanut-tree. This actually was to be planted in one of the courts of the Tinnevely pagoda, as a living and

growing witness to the event. It was an extraordinary and imposing sight that day, namely October 25th, 1881, when, before an immense crowd numbering several thousands of Hindus and other natives, the Delegates of the Buddhist Theosophical Societies of Ceylon, met with their brother Theosophists of the Tinnevely Branch and their Brahmin priests of the pagoda. For over 2,000 years an irreconcilable religious feud had raged between the two creeds and their respective followers. And now they were brought once more together on Hindu soil, and even within the thrice sacred, and to all strangers almost impenetrable, precincts of a Hindu temple, which would have been, only a few days previous to the occurrence, regarded as irretrievably desecrated had even the very shadow of a Buddhist *nastika* fallen upon its outward walls. Signs of the times, indeed! The cocoanut sprout was planted with great ceremony, and to the sounds of the music of the pagoda orchestra. After

that, year after year, Hindus and Buddhists met together at Adyar, at the Annual Conventions for the Anniversary Meetings of the Theosophical Parent Society; but no Brahmin Theosophist had hitherto returned the visit to Ceylon to his Buddhist Brethren. The ice of the centuries had been split, but not sufficiently broken to permit anyone to dive deep enough under it to call this an entire and full reconciliation. But the impressive and long-expected and wished-for event has at last taken place. All honour and glory to the son of Brahmins—the proudest; perhaps, of all India, the Northern Brahmins of Kashmir—who was the first to place the sacred duties of Universal Brotherhood above the prejudices, as potent as they are narrow, of caste and custom. We publish below extracts from his own address, which appeared in *Sarasavisandaresa*, the Singhalese organ of the Buddhists of Ceylon, and let the eloquent narrative speak for itself.

But after reading the extracts let not our critics rise once more against the policy of the Theosophical Society, and take the opportunity of calling it intolerant and uncharitable *only as regards one creed, namely Christianity* because facts will be found in this *Address* which speak loudly against its vicious system. No Theosophist has ever spoken against the teachings of Christ, no more than he did against those of Krishna, Buddha, or Sankaracharya; and willingly would he treat every Christian as a Brother, if the Christian himself would not persistently turn his back on the Theosophist. But a man would lose every right to the appellation of a member of the Universal Brotherhood, were he to keep silent in the face of the crying bigotry and falseness of all the theological, or rather sacerdotal, systems—the world over. We, Europeans, expatiate loudly and cry against Brahminical tyranny, against caste, against infant and widow marriage, and call every religious dogmatic rule (save our own) idiotic, pernicious, and devilish, and do it orally as in print. Why should not we confess and even denounce the abuses and defects of Christian theology and sacerdotalism as well? How dare we say to our “brother”—Let me cast out the mote out of thine eye, and refuse to

consider “*the beam that is in our own eye*”? Christians have to choose—either they “shall not judge that they be not judged,” or if they do—and one has but to read the missionary and clerical organs to see how cruel, unchristian, and uncharitable *their* judgments are—they *must be prepared to be judged in their turn*.

These are portions of an address delivered at the Theosophical Hall, Colombo, on January 29th, 1888, by Pundit Gopi Nath, of Lahore.*

[In the address referred to, Pundit Nath, a Kashmiri Brahmin, expresses his deep gratitude to the T.S. for the courage and impetus it gave him to over-leap the barriers of caste and custom in coming to the Buddhists of Ceylon. He pleads brotherhood between the two related religions of Buddhism and Brahminism, while urging them to respect their own religions and not to succumb to missionary attack upon the T.S. and its founders.

“It is the rule of the T.S. that its members, whatever their creed may be, shall treat the religions of other members with deference; and its principle is that all religions have some truth underlying them. . . . But between Brahminism and Buddhism we may have something much greater than mere toleration—we must have the deepest mutual esteem and reverence, for all learned people know that there is but little difference between our philosophies.”

Why then, is there so much bitter opposition between them, he asks? He attributes these quarrels and riots to the most ignorant and uneducated sources, people who do not appreciate the “bonds of mutual esteem.”

Further the pundit urges the Ceylonese Buddhists boldly to respect their own ancestral faith rather than adopt Christian names and customs, merely in hope of becoming respected by Europeans. This, he adds, is never the real outcome anyway. He cites several examples of a caste system, an extravagance and narrow-mindedness of a far worse nature among these very criticizers of their culture. Special warning is given to the people not to entrust their women and children into the hands of missionaries.

These foreigners do not come here and spend money for *our* benefit; no—they have one, and only one, great object always in view, and that is to make proselytes. However fair may be the outward appearance of their work, that design underlies everything they do, like a snake hidden under a flower, and for this object they will hesitate at no misrepresentation of your religion”]

* See the Ceylon paper, the *Sarasavisandaresa*, of January 31, 1888.

This sincere and unpretentious address shows better than pages written by ourselves could, the work that the Theosophical Society has done in India, as also the reason why the missionaries in that country bear to us such a mortal hatred, hence—why they slander us. They degrade the pure ethics of Christ by their Jesuitical and deceptive attitude towards the natives; and we protect the latter against such deception by telling them: “There is but ONE

Eternal Truth, one universal, infinite and changeless Spirit of Love, Truth and Wisdom, impersonal, therefore bearing a different name with every nation, one Light for all, in which the whole Humanity lives and moves, and has its being. Like the spectrum in optics, giving multicoloured and various rays, which are yet caused by one and the same sun, so theologies and sacerdotal systems are many. But the Universal religion *can only be one*, if we accept the real, primitive meaning of the root of that word. We, Theosophists, so accept it; and therefore say: We are all brothers—by the laws of Nature, of birth, and death, as also by the laws of our utter helplessness from birth to death in this world of sorrow and deceptive illusions. Let us, then, love, help, and mutually defend each other against this spirit of deception; and while holding to that which each of us accepts as his ideal of truth and reality—*i.e.*, to the religion which suits each of us best—let us unite ourselves to form a practical ‘nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF RACE, CREED, OR COLOUR.’ ”

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

“BUDDHIST DOCTRINE OF THE WESTERN HEAVEN”

135

FOOTNOTES TO “BUDDHIST DOCTRINE OF THE WESTERN HEAVEN”

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 8, April, 1888, pp. 108-117]

[The well-known scholar, Rev. Joseph Edkins, D.D., contributes a long essay in which he discusses with much learning the ideas prevalent among the Buddhists concerning the future state of man and the hope of an after-life. He attempts to trace the origin of these beliefs. A number of footnotes have been appended by H. P. B. to various expressions of Dr. Edkins which appear below within square brackets.]

[union with Buddha . . . attained by the loss of personality] The loss of the *false* or temporary personality by its transformation into the ABSOLUTE “Ego.”

[many prefer to meditate on the Paradise of Amitabha, the Buddha of a world situated in the West . . . as the home they may attain this hope exists among the Buddhists. And it is a curious question whether it was occasioned by Persian or by Christian influence, or . . . was entirely self-originated.]

Most undeniably the idea was originated by neither of the above-named influences, no more than the knowledge of the Zodiac, astronomy or architecture was ever originated in India “by the Greek influence,” agreeably with Dr. Weber’s and Professor Max Müller’s favourite hobbies. This “hope” is based on *knowledge*, on the secret esoteric doctrines preached by Gautama Buddha, and flashes of which are still found even in the semi-exoteric tenets of the schools of Mahayana, Aryasangha and others.

[Buddhist works began to be translated into Chinese about the year 67 A.D.] Buddhist works may have appeared in China not earlier than 67 A.D.; but there are as good proofs and evidence, from Chinese and Tibetan History as much as from Buddhist records, that the tenets of Gautama reached China as early as the year 683 of the Tzin era (436 B.C.). Of course in this instance we accept Buddhist chronology, not the fanciful annals of the Western Orientalists, who base their chronological and *historical* computations on the so-called “Vikramaditya era,” while ignorant to this day of the date when Vikramaditya really lived.

136

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

[Belief in the magical powers of the Buddhists had much to do with the spread of their religion, and not less influential was the superstitious regard for the sacred books . . .]

No more, we say, than the “miracles” of the *New Testament* had to do with the spread of the Christian religion. Then why should any fair-minded person, even if a missionary, denounce the reverence of Buddhists for their sacred books as “*a superstitious regard*,” while enforcing the same “superstitious regard” for the *Bible*, under the penalty, moreover, of eternal damnation?

[*Akshobya*, the companion Buddha to *Amitabha* and ruler of the Eastern Universe . . . these two Buddhas are mentioned together. They were . . . contemporaneous in origin.]

That origin must be archaic indeed, since both the names are found in the *Book of Dzyan*, classed with the Dhyana-Chohans (*Pitris*), the “Fathers of man,” who answer to the seven Elohim.

[Parthian Jews . . . returned from keeping the Pentecost at Jerusalem to their own country, and carried with them Christian convictions] It would be more correct, perhaps, to say “Gnostic,” instead of “Christian” convictions. The Jews could be Gnostics without renouncing Judaism.

[world of punishment (*Naraka*), which to the Buddhists are prisons, fiery hot, or icy cold, where every kind of torture is used] Which, however, are all metaphorical expressions, whenever used. Buddhists have never believed in their philosophy in any Hell as a locality. Avitchi is a *state* and a condition, and the tortures therein are all mental.

[forgiveness of injuries, contentment, pity are very Christian] They are “Christian” only because Christianity has accepted them. All these virtues were taught and practised by Buddha 600 years B.C.; as other Chinese and Indian good men and adepts accepted and taught them to the multitudes thousands of years B.B., or before Buddha. Why call them “Christian,” since they are universal?

[the *Vedanta* philosophy finds the origin of transmigration and other evils in God who is the cause of virtue and

“BUDDHIST DOCTRINE OF THE WESTERN HEAVEN”

137

vice] The *Vedanta* philosophy finds nothing of the kind, nor does it teach of a God (least of all with a capital *G*). But there is a sect of Vedantins, the *Visishtadwaita*, who, refusing to accept *dualism*, have, *nolens volens*, to place the origin of all evil as of all good in Parabrahman. But Parabrahman *is not* “God” in the Christian sense, at any rate in the *Vedanta* philosophy.

[Buddhism . . . being atheistic] Atheistic, inasmuch as it very reasonably rejects the idea of any personal anthropomorphic god. Its secret philosophy, however, explains the causes of rebirths or “transmigration.”

[retribution follows all actions by unseen fate compelling it] This “unseen fate” is KARMA.

[producing and strengthening faith] Buddha preached against *blind* faith and enforced knowledge and reason.

[concerning the alleged influence exercised by Christians upon Eastern beliefs, etc.] It would be far more correct to say that it is the early Christians, or the Gnostics rather, who were influenced by Buddhist doctrines, than the reverse. All these ideas of Devachan, etc., were inculcated by Buddhism from the first. No foreign influence there, surely. It cannot be proved *historically*, that the “Apostle Peter” had preached the gospel in Parthia, not even that the blessed “Apostle,” whose relics are shown at Goa, went there at all. But it is an *historical fact*, that a century before the Christian era, Buddhist monks crowded into Syria and Babylon, and that Buddhasp (Bodhisattva), the so-called Chaldean, was the founder of Sabism or *baptism*. And Renan, in his *Vie de Jesus*, says, that [it was] “the religion of multiplied baptisms, the scion of the still existent sect, named the ‘Christians of St. John’ or Mendeans, whom the Arabs call *el-mogtasila* or ‘Baptists.’ The Aramean verb *seba*, origin of the name *Sabian*, is a synonym of \$"BJ\T.” *

[regarding Babylonian astrologers and diviners residing at Indian seaports and being at the courts of Rajahs, bringing with them Babylonian and Egyptian doctrines]

* [Pages 102-03, in 65th ed., Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1923.—*Comp.*]

There is one little impediment, however, in the way of such a “Weberian” theory. There is no *historical* evidence that the “Chaldean astrologers and diviners” were ever at the courts of Indian Rajahs *before the* days of Alexander. But it is a perfectly established historical fact, as pointed out by Colonel Vans Kennedy, that it was, on the contrary, Babylonia which was once the seat of the Sanskrit language and of Brahmanical influence.*

* [The actual passage from the works of Col. Vans Kennedy which H. P. B. has in mind is not definitely known, but the idea itself is very clearly expressed on pp. 199-201 of his *Researches into the Origin and Affinities of the principal Languages of Asia and Europe*. London, 1828. 4to. *Vide* Bio-Bibliogr. Index, s.v. KENNEDY, for other works by this scholar.—*Compiler.*]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

FOOTNOTES AND COMMENT ON “ULTIMATE PHILOSOPHY”

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 8, April, 1888, pp. 136-141]

[The following footnotes and closing Editorial Note are appended by H.P.B. to an article of Herbert L. Courtney, on the general subject of Hylo-Idealism:]

[is there aught beyond consciousness?] Most decidedly not. “There is naught *beyond consciousness*,” a Vedantin and a Theosophist would say, because Absolute Consciousness is infinite and limitless, and there is nothing that can be said to be “beyond” that which is ALL, the self-container, containing all. But the Hylo-Idealists deny the Vedantic idea of *non-separateness*, they deny that we are but parts of the whole; deny, in common parlance, “God,” Soul and Spirit, and yet they will talk of “apprehension” and intuition—the function and attribute of man’s *immortal* Ego, and make of it a function of *matter*. Thus they vitiate every one of their arguments.

COMMENT ON “ULTIMATE PHILOSOPHY”

139

[let “I am” = consciousness—or “sensation” or any other word . . . so that it includes all thought . . . all connected with the *ego* in itself] In this paragraph we find the old crux of philosophy—the question as to whether there is any “external reality” in nature—cropping up again. The solution offered is a pure assumption, reached by ignoring one of the fundamental facts of *human* consciousness, the *feeling* that the *cause* of sensation, etc., lies outside the limited, human self. Mr. Courtney, we believe, aims at expressing a conception identical with that of the Adwaita Vedantins of India. But his language is inaccurate and misleading to those who understand his words in their usual sense, *e.g.*, when he speaks of the “I am” outside of which nothing can exist, he is stating a purely Vedantin tenet; but then the “I” in question is *not* the “I” which acts, feels or thinks, but that absolute consciousness which is no consciousness.

It is this confusion between the various ideas represented by “I” which lies at the root of the difficulty—the only philosophical explanation of which rests in the *esoteric* Vedantin doctrine of “Maya,” or Illusion.

[How can I be self and yet *not* self at the same time?] Very easily. You have only to postulate that *self* is *one*, *eternal* and infinite, the *only* REALITY; and your little self a transient illusion, a reflected ray of the SELF, therefore a *not*-Self. If the Vedantin idea is “meaningless” to the writer, his theory is still more so—to us.

[Beyond consciousness all is (to me) a blank, and all that enters consciousness

becomes part of myself thereby] This phrase is an admirable illustration in proof of the remarks made in the last foot-note. “Things *enter* consciousness,” says Mr. Courtney, and it is no word-splitting to point out to him, that not only is it impossible for him to speak without these words or others equivalent to them, but further that he *cannot think* at all except in terms of these conceptions. It follows that, since he is not talking nonsense, he is trying to express in terms of the mind, what properly transcends mind—in other words we are brought back to the ancient doctrine of “Maya” again.

Daily experience shows him that things do *enter* consciousness and, in some sense, become part of himself—but where and what were they, before entering *his* consciousness? Let him study the doctrine of limitation and “reflected” centres of consciousness, and he will understand himself more clearly.

[upon the fact of its own existence the ego cannot reason] A Mystic would take exception to this statement, at least if the word “reason” is used by Mr. Courtney in the sense of “know”:—for his great achievement is “Self”-knowledge, meaning not only the analytical knowledge of his own limited personality, but the synthetical knowledge of “ONE” EGO from which that passing personality sprang.

[O, light divine, thy reproduction is impossible] How are we to understand “light *divine*” in the thought of a Hylo-Idealist, who limits the whole universe to the phantasms of the grey matter of the brain—that matter and its productions being alike illusions? In our humble opinion this philosophy is twin sister to the cosmogony of the *orthodox* Brahmins, who teach that the world is supported by an elephant, which stands upon a tortoise, the tortoise wagging its tail in absolute Void. We beg our friends, the Hylo-Idealists’, pardon; but, so long as such evident contradictions are not more satisfactorily explained, we can hardly take them seriously, or give them henceforth *so much* space.

EDITORS’ NOTE

The editors were kindly informed by Dr. Lewins that Miss C. Naden was on her way to India *via* Egypt (whence she sent us her excellent little letter published in the February *Lucifer*), well furnished with letters from Professor Max Müller to introduce her to sundry eminent “Sanskrit Pundits in the Three Presidencies for the purpose of studying Occultism on its native soil,” as Dr. Lewins explains. We heartily wish Miss Naden success; but we feel as sure she will return not a whit wiser in Occultism than when she went. We lived in India for

many years, and have never yet met with a "Sanskrit Pundit"—officially recognised as such—who knew anything of Occultism. We met with several occultists in India who will not speak; and with but one who is a really learned Occultist (the most learned, perhaps, of all in India), who condescends occasionally to open his mouth and teach. This he never does, however, outside a very small group of Theosophists. Nor do we feel like concealing the sad fact, that a letter from Mr. Max Müller, asking the pundits to divulge occult matter to an English traveller, would rather produce the opposite effect to the one anticipated. The Oxford Professor is very much beloved by the orthodox Hindus, innocent of all knowledge of their esoteric philosophy. Those who are Occultists, however, feel less enthusiastic, for the sins of omission and commission by the great Anglo-German Sanskritist are many. His ridiculous dwarfing of the Hindu chronology, to pander to the Mosaic, probably, and his denying to the Ancient Aryas any knowledge of even Astronomy except through Greek channels—are not calculated to make of him a new Rishi in the eyes of Aryanophiles. If learning about Occultism is Miss Naden's chief object in going to India, then, it is to be feared, she has started on a wild-goose's chase. Hindus and Brahmins are not such fools as we Europeans are, on the subject of the sacred sciences, and they will hardly desecrate that which is holy, by giving it unnecessary publicity.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
April, 1888

142

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

**CHRISTIAN LECTURES ON BUDDHISM, AND
PLAIN FACTS ABOUT THE SAME, BY
BUDDHISTS**

[*Lucifer*. Vol. II, No. 8, April, 1888, pp. 142-149]

“Then spake Jesus . . . saying: *The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat*. . . BUT DO NOT YE AFTER THEIR WORKS, FOR THEY SAY, AND DO NOT. . . *but all their works they do for to be seen by men*: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, and love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and *the chief seats in the synagogues*. . .

“But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! *for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men*. . . ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel. . . Woe unto you . . . *for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, YE MAKE HIM TWO-FOLD MORE THE CHILD OF HELL THAN YOURSELVES!*” —(*Matt.*, xxiii, 1-6, 13, 24, 15 resp.)

The *Scotsman* of March 8th, 1888, is high in its praises of some recent lectures on Buddhism, delivered by Sir Monier-Williams, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., of Oxford. Notwithstanding the chairman’s (Lord Polwarth’s) allegation that

On the subject of Buddhism, he thought there was no one more qualified to instruct them than the gentleman who had undertaken the present course [*i.e.*, Sir Monier-Williams],

most of the statements made by the titled lecturer court contradiction and need correction. Plain and unvarnished truths may not elicit the applause certain arbitrary assumptions made by the lecturer called forth in the land of Fingal, but they may help to sweep away a few cobwebs of latent prejudice from the minds of some of your readers—and that’s all a Buddhist cares about.

The learned lecturer premised by saying that:

Buddhism had been alleged to be the religion of the majority of the human race, but happily that was not now true. Christianity now stood, even numerically, at the head of all the creeds of the world. (Applause.)—[*Scotsman*.]

Is this really so? Applause is no argument in favour of the correctness of a statement. Nor does one know of any special qualification in the Oxford professor that could make him override statistical proofs to the contrary, unless it be that his wish is father to the thought, as usual. The 200 millions of proselytes to the Mussulman faith as against one million of converts of Christianity in this century alone, a *fact* complained of at the Church Conference by Dr. Taylor, hardly a few weeks ago, would rather clash with this statement. * The Rev. Joseph Edkins, who passed almost all his life in China, studying Buddhism and its growth, says in *Chinese Buddhism* (1880, p. viii, Preface) that Buddhism is now “one among the world’s religions which has acquired the greatest multitude

* “The faith of Islam is spreading over Africa with giant strides. . . . Christianity is receding before Islam, while attempts to proselytise Mohammedans are notoriously unsuccessful. We not only fail to gain ground, but even fail to hold our own. . . . An African tribe once converted to Islam never returns to Paganism, and never embraces Christianity. . . . When Mohammedanism is embraced by a negro tribe, devil-worship, cannibalism, human sacrifice, witchcraft, and infanticide disappear. Filth is replaced by cleanliness, and they acquire personal dignity and self-respect. Hospitality becomes a religious duty, drunkenness becomes rare, gambling is forbidden. . . . A feeling of humanity, benevolence, and brotherhood is inculcated. . . The strictly-regulated polygamy of Moslem lands is infinitely less degrading to women and less injurious to men than the promiscuous polyandry which is the curse of Christian cities, and which is absolutely unknown in Islam. The polyandrous English are not entitled to cast stones at polygamous Moslems. . . . Islam, above all, is the most powerful total abstinence society in the world; whereas the extension of European trade means the extension of drunkenness and vice, and the degradation of the people. Islam introduces a knowledge of reading and writing, decent clothes, personal cleanliness, and self-respect. . . . How little have we to show for the vast sums of money and precious lives lavished upon Africa! Christian converts are reckoned by thousands; Moslem converts by millions . . . (CANON ISAAC TAYLOR, “Christianity and Mohammedanism.”)

[These excerpts are from an address delivered by Canon I. Taylor, of New York, at the Wolverhampton Congress of the Church Missionary Society, in England, in October, 1887. A similar but somewhat different wording can be found in *The Rock* of October 14, 1887.— *Compiler*.]

of adherents.” Nor can this learned Chinese scholar, a zealous missionary, be suspected of unfairness to *his* religion. Nor does the very conservative *Standard*, when complaining that England is *no longer a Christian nation* and that *a very large percentage of its population no longer accepts* the religion embodied in the Bible, bear out Sir Monier-Williams’ optimistic views. Nor yet is this opinion supported by what the whole world knows of modern France, Germany and Italy, eaten to the core with free-thought and Atheism.

To say, therefore, as the lecturer did, that he doubts “were a trustworthy census possible” if Buddhism

would give even 150 millions of Buddhists, or rather pseudo-Buddhists, as against 450 millions of Christians in the world’s population, estimated at 1,500 millions [*Scotsman*.]*

—is rather a risky thing. Let us not talk of “*pseudo*-Buddhists” in the face of millions of “*pseudo*-Christians,” nominal and more “Grundy-fearing” than God-fearing; and for this reason still pretending to be called Christians. And if the term *pseudo* was applied by the lecturer to the teeming millions of China, Japan, and Tibet, who have fallen off from the purity of the primitive church of Buddha, burning low even in Siam, Burma, and Ceylon, and which have split themselves into many sects, then just the same is found in the 300 or so of Protestant sects, which differ so widely and fight for dogmatic differences, and still call themselves Christians. “Were a trustworthy census possible,” and a fair appreciation of truth preferred to self-glorification, then the 2,000,000 of Freethinkers,

* Says Emil Schlagintweit, in his *Buddhism in Tibet*, pp. 11-12, in comparing the number of Buddhists to that of Christians—“For these regions of Asia [China, Japan, Indo-Chinese Peninsula, etc.], we obtain, therefore, according to these calculations [of Prof. Dieterici], an approximate total of 534 millions of inhabitants. *At least two-thirds of this population may be considered to be Buddhist*; the remainder includes the followers of Confucius and Lao-tse.” Result, according to Dieterici, 340,000,000 of Buddhists and only 330,000,000 of Christians—all *nominal* Christians included. [Italics are H.P.B.’s.—*Comp.*]

CHRISTIAN LECTURES ON BUDDHISM

145

and the 11,000,000 of those “of no particular religion,” as specified even in *Whitaker’s Almanack*, might grow to tenfold their number and produce a salutary check on inaccurate lecturers. This inaccuracy may be better appreciated by throwing a glance at the census-tables of India of 1881. In that country indeed, where missionaries have been labouring for centuries, and where they are now as numerous—and quite as mischievous—as the crows in the land of Manu, the distribution of its religious denominations stands in round numbers as follows:

Hindus (male and female	... 188,000,000
Mohammedans	... 50,000,000
Aborigines	... 7,000,000
Buddhists	... 3,050,000
Jains (Buddhists)	... 1,020,000
Christians	... 1,800,000

The 1,800,000 of Christians, note well, include all the Europeans resident in India, the army, the civil servants, the Eurasians and native Christians.

And is it to curry further favour with his Sabbath-worshipping audience and elicit from it further applause, that the knighted lecturer characterised Buddhism as “a false, diseased and moribund system, which had continued [nevertheless?!] for more than two thousand years to attract and delude immense populations”? This, in the teeth of his great Oxford rival, Professor Max Müller, who pronounces the moral code of Buddhism “one of the

most perfect the world has ever known.” So do Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, Klaproth, and other Orientalists, more fair minded than the lecturer under notice.

Says Mr. P. Hordern, the Director of Public Instruction in Burma:—

“The poor heathen is guided in his daily life by precepts older and *not less noble than the precepts of Christianity*. Centuries before the birth of Christ, men were taught *by the life and doctrine of one of the greatest men who ever lived*, lessons of pure morality. The child is taught to obey his parents, and to be tender to all animal life, *the man to love his neighbour as himself*, to be true and just in all his dealings, and to look beyond the

vain shows of the world for true happiness. Every shade of vice is guarded by special precepts. Love in its widest sense of universal charity is declared to be the mother of all the virtues, *and even the peculiarly Christian precepts of the forgiveness of injuries, and the meek acceptance of insult were already taught in the farthest East, ages before Christianity.**

Such is “*the false and diseased system*” of Buddhism which is less “moribund” however, even now, than is in our present age the perverted system of Him whose Sermon on the Mount, grand as it is, yet taught nothing that had not been taught ages before. I will show presently, on the authority of statistics and the Church again, which of the two—Buddhists or Christians—live more nearly according to the grand and the same morality preached by their respective Masters.

The Professor is more lenient though to the Founder than to the system. He would not, he said:

Be far wrong in asserting that intense individuality, fervid earnestness, severe simplicity of character, combined with singular beauty of countenance, calm dignity of bearing, and almost super-human persuasiveness of speech, were conspicuous in the great teacher. —[*Scotsman*.]

Forthwith, however, and fearing he had said too much, the Professor hastened to throw a gloomy shadow on the bright picture drawn. To quote from the *Scotsman* once more:

Alluding to the first sermon of the Buddha, the lecturer remarked that, however unfavourably it might compare with the first discourse of Christ—a discourse, not addressed to a few monks, but to suffering sinners—it was of great interest, because it embodied the first teaching of one who, if *not worthy* to be called the “*Light of Asia*” and certainly unworthy of comparison with the “*Light of the World*,” was at least one of the world’s most successful teachers.

To this charitable Christian criticism, ever forgetful of the wise Shakespeare’s remark that “*comparisons are odorous*,” † a Buddhist, who only defends *his* faith, is amply

* Quoted in *Chinese Buddhism*, by Rev. J. Edkins, page 201.

† [*Much Ado About Nothing*, Act III, Sc. v, line 18.]

justified in replying as follows: However much the worthiness of our Lord Buddha to be called by the appellation of the “Light of Asia” may be contested by religious intolerance, this title is, at any rate, addressed to an *historical* personage. The actual existence of Gautama Buddha cannot be called in question; neither Materialist nor Christian, Jew nor Gentile, can ever presume to call him a myth. On the other hand, (a) the “Light of the World,” having failed to illumine the whole of Humanity—as even on the lecturer’s admission only 400 out of 1,500 millions of the world population are Christians—the title is a misnomer most evidently, and (b) the very personal existence of the Founder of Christianity—mostly on account of the supernatural character claimed for it, but also because no valid, real, historical evidence can be brought forward to prove it—is now denied by millions of not only Free-thinkers and Materialists, but even of intellectual Christians and critical Bible-scholars.

Nor are the remarks of Sir Monier-Williams concerning the death of Buddha “said to have been caused by eating too much pork, *or dried boar’s flesh*,” any happier. That fact alone that one, who claims to be regarded as a great Orientalist, and yet observes that: “As this statement was somewhat derogatory to his [Buddha’s] dignity, it was less likely to have been fabricated,” shows in a “Sanskrit scholar” a pitiable ignorance of Hindu symbolism, as well as a wonderful lack of intuition.

How one who is acquainted with the primitive and original teachings of Buddha, as recorded by his personal disciples, can think for a moment that the great Asiatic Reformer ate flesh, passes comprehension! Leaving aside every dogmatic and certainly later exoteric ecclesiastical reason fathered on Buddha for sparing the life of animals on the ground of metempsychosis,* one has but to read the Buddhist metaphysical treatises upon *Karma*, to see all the

* Neither in China nor Tibet, says the Rev. J. Edkins, do the Buddhist monks (the real *literati* of the nations) accept the exoteric teaching that the souls of men can migrate into animals. It is simply allegorical.

absurdity of such a statement. The great doctrine delivered by Gautama *a few days* before he entered Nirvana to Maha Ka□yapa, contains among other prohibitions *that of eating animal food*. The “Great Development School refers it to this period,” says the same authority upon Chinese Buddhism, and no lover of it, the Rev. J. Edkins; and the

Bodhisattvas are even more strictly prohibited than even monks. In “The Book of Heaven through keeping the Ten prohibitions” a Deva informs Buddha that he was born in Indra @akra’s heaven “for keeping them; for not inflicting death, or stealing, or committing adultery . . . or *drinking wine, or eating flesh,*” etc.

The scholar who knows that the first *Avatar* of Brahmâ was in *the shape of a boar*, and who is aware, (a) that the Brahmins have ever identified themselves with the God from whom they claim descent; and (b) know the bitter opposition they offered to the “World’s Honoured One,” Gautama Buddha, trying to take more than once his life, will readily comprehend the allusion in the allegory. It is an esoteric tradition, and is no longer extant in writing, any more than is the explanation of many other allegories. Yet the inconsistency alone of the charge ought to have suggested to the mind of any less prejudiced scholar the suspicion that the legend of Tsonda’s meal of rice and pork was some esoteric allegory. No wonder if even Bishop Bigandet remarks that “a thick veil wraps in complete obscurity this *curious* episode of Buddha’s life.” It is “the obscurity” of *ignorance*.

It is quite true that Buddhists lay no claim to “*supernatural* inspiration” for their sacred scriptures, and it is in this that lies a portion of their success. The word “priest,” the audience was told, could not be applied to Buddhist monks “because they have no divine revelation.” At this rate there never were any priests before the Jews and Christians as no “*divine* revelation” is allowed to any nation outside these two? Further the lecturer elicited a great laugh and applause by telling his audience the following anecdote:

Gautama Buddha also instituted an order of nuns, and the monks once asked Gautama, it was said, what they should do when they saw

women. The Buddha replied, “Do not see them.” They then asked, “But if we do see them?” He replied, “Then don’t speak to them.” “But,” they asked, “if they speak to us?” And the Buddha answered, “Then do not answer them; let your thoughts be fixed in profound meditation.” (Laughter.)—[*Scotsman*.]

Verses 27 and 28 in Chapter v of *Matthew*, lend themselves as easily to satirical remarks. The injunction by Buddha, “let your thoughts be fixed in profound meditation,” is virtually implied in that other injunction, “Ye have heard. . . Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.”

Were the Christians to follow this command of their noble Master as faithfully as Buddhists do the orders of their Lord—there would be no need for the establishment in England of a “Vigilance Society” for the protection of female children and girls; nor would the editor of the *Pall Mall* have got three months’ imprisonment for telling the truth and speaking against a crying and horrid evil, unheard-of in Buddhist communities.

Further, the lecturer remarked, that “Gautama never tolerated priestcraft.” Nor has Jesus, and I maintain it; His denunciations of sacerdotalism and the Rabbis who teach the Law of Moses and lay heavy burdens on men’s shoulders which “they *themselves* will not move with one of their fingers,” (*Matt.*, xxiii, 4); His prohibition to make a parade of

prayers in synagogues and command to enter into one's closet to pray (*Matt.*, v, 27-28); as also the absence of any injunction from him to establish a *dogmatic* church—prove it. Therefore Sir M. Williams' accusation that Buddha's "followers in other countries became entangled in a network of sacerdotalism more enslaving than that from which he had rescued them," applies to Christianity with far greater force than to Buddhism. And if "the precept enjoining celibacy sufficiently accounted for the fact that Buddhism never gained any stability or permanency in India," how is it that the Roman Catholics, whose religion *enjoins the same precept* for priests and monks, show such tremendous odds against

Protestantism? And if celibacy be "a transgression of the laws of nature," as the lecturer says—and so say the Brahmins, for even Gautama Buddha was married and had a son before he became an ascetic—why should Jesus have never married and advised celibacy, to his disciples? For it is celibacy at best, which is enjoined to those who *are able to receive it* in verses 10, 11 and 12, of *Matthew* xix, the literal term implying still worse "and there are eunuchs, *which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake*. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

So that monastic Buddhism, it seems, is called *idiotic* by the lecturer only for doing that which Jesus Christ himself advised his disciples to do, *if they can*. A very curious way of glorifying one's God!

As to the respective merits of Buddhism and Christianity, as a Buddhist who may be suspected of partiality, I shall leave the burden of establishing the comparison to the Christians themselves. This is what one reads in the *Tablet*, the leading organ of Roman Catholic Englishmen, about Creeds and Criminality. I underline the most remarkable statements.

The official statement as to the moral and material progress of India, which has recently been published, supplies a very interesting contribution to the controversy on the missionary question. It appears from these figures that while we effect *a very marked moral deterioration in the natives by converting them to our creed*, THEIR NATURAL STANDARD OF MORALITY IS SO HIGH that, however much we Christianize them, *we cannot succeed in making them altogether as bad as ourselves*. The figures representing the proportions of criminality in the several classes, are as follows:—

EUROPEANS	1 in 274
Eurasians *	1 in 509
Native Christians	1 in 799
Mahomedans	1 in 856
Hindoos	1 in 1,361
BUDDHISTS	1 in 3,787

* The fruits of European chastity and moral virtue, and of the obedience of Christians to the commands of Jesus.

The last item, [says the *Tablet*] is a magnificent tribute to the exalted purity of Buddhism, but the statistics are instructive throughout, and enforce with resistless power the conclusion that, as a mere matter of social polity, we should do much better if we devoted our superfluous cash and zeal, for a generation or two, to the ethical improvement of our own countrymen, instead of trying to upset the morality, together with the theology, of people WHO MIGHT REASONABLY SEND OUT MISSIONS TO CONVERT US.

No better answer than this could a Buddhist find as a reply to the uncharitable and incorrect comparisons between the two creeds instituted by Sir Monier-Williams. He should remember, however, the words of his Master, “Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.”

To this rejoinder by a Buddhist to the Oxford Professor we may append a few more interesting facts from Buddhists, in this connection. They are very suggestive, inasmuch as firstly they show how religious bigotry and intolerance make people entirely blind and deaf to every fact and reason; and secondly how we, Europeans, understand fairness and justice. The extracts that follow are taken from a Singhalese newspaper, the organ of the Ceylon Buddhists and edited by Buddhist Theosophists. It is called *The Sarasavisandaresa*. The two editorials, written in English, of the 14th and the 27th of February of the present year, contain two complaints; the first of which is against the very notorious editor of the Colombo *Observer*. This personage, than whom no more slanderous or wicked bigot ever walked the earth, as shown by his being perpetually brought to justice for defamation by Christians and natives—is a deep-water Baptist, without one spark of Christian ethics in him. His sledge-hammer-like charges against Buddhism, will appear curious after the fair confession of the *Tablet* just quoted. But we shall let our Brother editor—a Buddhist Theosophist—speak for his countrymen. For unless their grievances are brought to the notice of at least a portion of the English readers in *Lucifer*, there is little chance indeed that the outside

world should ever hear of them from other papers or magazines. Says the editorial on “Crime in Ceylon”:—

We notice a paragraph in our contemporary the *Observer* referring to an atrocious crime recently committed in the neighbourhood of Ratnapura. According to the account given one man murdered another, and “then, standing over him, committed an offence which cannot even be mentioned.” While we have no

idea what this can mean, we have no doubt that some horrible atrocity is intended, and we sincerely hope that the fullest justice will be meted out to the abominable villain who committed it. But of course the insane bigotry of our contemporary would not allow him to be satisfied with merely giving the dreadful news; no, he must add a comment which is itself, in the eyes of all right-thinking men, an atrocity of the blackest description. We regret to give the publicity of our wider circulation to so scandalous a remark; yet we feel it our duty to let our countrymen see to what despicable shifts the missionary organ is reduced in its futile efforts to find some ground to vilify our faith. "Is there any country under the sun," it asks,—“any people save Buddhists—where and by whom such awful atrocities could be perpetrated?” Unhesitatingly we answer “Yes; whatever the crime may have been, its horror is more than equalled— it is surpassed—by the diabolical outrages committed in Christian England in this nineteenth century.”

Follow several noted facts of crimes recently committed in England. But, pertinently remarks the editor:—

Does our contemporary wish that Christianity as a system should be held responsible for the ghastly crimes daily committed in its very strongholds? Such a course would be obviously unfair, yet his sense of honour permits him to treat Buddhism in the same manner.

Observe that there is no evidence at all that the criminal professes Buddhism; we know nothing of the facts of the case, but arguing from experience the presumption would be against such a supposition. At the present moment there are three prisoners under sentence of death in Welikada Jail, all of whom are Christians; and there are also two Christians (one of them a church official) convicted of murder at Kurunagala.

• • • • •

The proportion of crime among Christians is about fifteen times as great as among Buddhists; and it is considered a truism in India to say that every person perverted to Christianity from some other religion adds one more to the suspected list of the police.

This is a fact, and all who have been in India will hardly deny it.

CHRISTIAN LECTURES ON BUDDHISM

153

The other case is a crime of Vandalism, though to desecrate other nations' sacred relics is considered no crime at all by the Christian officials. It tells eloquently its own tale:

A DESECRATION

A very unpleasant rumour has reached us from Anuradhapura. It is well known that men have been at work there for a long time under the orders of the Government Agent, professedly restoring the ruined Dagobas. This, so far, is a truly royal work, and one with which we have every sympathy. But now report says that the work of restoration, which consisted chiefly in clearing away the ruins and masses of fallen earth, so that the beautiful carvings and statues might once more be visible in their entirety as at first, has been abandoned in favour of excavations into the Dagobas themselves. We hear that a tunnel has been pierced almost into the centre of the great Abhayagiriya Dagoba in search of treasure, relics, and ancient books, and it is further reported that some important discoveries have already been made, but that whatever has been found has been secretly removed by night. It is said, too, that when the High Priest of the Sacred BO-TREE, to whom the Dagoba belongs, applied for permission to see the articles exhumed, only a very small portion was shown to him.

Now we can scarcely bring ourselves to admit the possibility of all this; it seems quite incredible that a government like that of the English should stain its annals with such an act of vandalism as the desecration of our sacred places, though certainly if it *could* descend to such an action it would be quite in keeping that the treasure-trove should be removed secretly and guiltily.

No doubt it would be difficult for even the more liberal-minded of our foreign rulers to understand fully the thrill of horror which every true Buddhist would feel on hearing of the disturbance of these time-honoured monuments. It would probably be argued by Christians that whatever may be buried under the Dagobas, whether relics, treasure, or books, is quite useless where it is; whereas if brought to light the books would supply very valuable copies of old Pali texts, the treasures (if any) would be useful to the Government, and the relics would be an interesting acquisition to the shelves of the British Museum. Singhalese Buddhists, however, in spite of centuries of oppression and persecution under Dutch and Portuguese adventurers, have still a deeply-rooted feeling of respect and love for the monuments of the golden age of their religion, and to hear that they are being disturbed by the sacrilegious hand of the foreigner will stir them to their inmost souls. These Dagobas are now objects of veneration to thousands of pilgrims, not only from all parts of Ceylon, but also from other Buddhist countries; but if once the relics buried in them are

removed, they will be no more to us than any other mound of earth. Even if, as has been suggested, the Government intend merely to examine whatever may be discovered, and afterwards replace it, to our ideas the disturbance of the sacred monuments of our religion by alien hands would still be terrible desecration, against which every true-hearted Buddhist ought at once to protest most vigorously by every means in his power. If the sad news be true, Buddhists should at once combine to hold indignation meetings all over the country, and to get up a monster petition to the Governor begging him to prevent the recurrence of such an outrage on their religious feelings. But until confirmation arises we cling to the hope that the rumours may be baseless, and should this prove to be the case none will rejoice more heartily than we. We trust that the Government Agent of the Province, or some responsible official connected with the work, will embrace this opportunity of telling the public what is really being done at Anuradhapura, and thereby relieve the anxiety which must agitate all Buddhist hearts until the question is set at rest.

The Abhayagiriya Dagoba was erected by King Walagambahu in the year B.C. 89, to commemorate the recovery of his throne after the expulsion of the Malabar invaders. When entire, it was the most stupendous Dagoba in Ceylon, being 405 feet high, and standing on about eight acres of ground; but so ruthlessly have the older destroyers done their work that its present height is not much more than 230 feet. At its base are some very fine specimens of stone carving, and various fragments of bold frescoes. The Dagoba is quite encircled with the ruins of buildings large and small, for a larger college of priests was attached to this than to any of the other sacred places at Anuradhapura.

We hope our Singhalese Colleague and Brother will send us further information upon this subject. Every Theosophist and lover of antiquity, whether Christian or of alien faith, would deplore with the Buddhists the loss of such precious relics of a period the editor has so aptly described as “the golden age of their religion.” We hope it may not be true. But alas, we are in *Kali Yuga*.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

PRACTICAL OCCULTISM

155

PRACTICAL OCCULTISM

IMPORTANT TO STUDENTS

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 8, April, 1888, pp. 150-154]

As some of the letters in the CORRESPONDENCE of this month show, there are many people who are looking for practical instruction in Occultism. It becomes necessary therefore, to state once for all:—

(a) The essential difference between theoretical and practical Occultism; or what is generally known as Theosophy on the one hand, and Occult science on the other, and:—

(b) The nature of the difficulties involved in the study of the latter.

It is easy to become a Theosophist. Any person of average intellectual capacities, and a leaning toward the meta-physical; of pure, unselfish life, who finds more joy in helping his neighbour than in receiving help himself; one who is ever ready to sacrifice his own pleasures for the sake of other people; and who loves Truth, Goodness and Wisdom for their own sake, not for the benefit they may confer—is a Theosophist.

But it is quite another matter to put oneself upon the path which leads to the knowledge of what is good to do, as to the right discrimination of good from evil; a path which also leads a man to that power through which he can do the good he desires, often without even apparently lifting a finger.

Moreover, there is one important fact with which the student should be made acquainted. Namely, the enormous, almost limitless, responsibility assumed by the teacher for the sake of the pupil. From the Gurus of the East who teach openly or secretly, down to the few Kabalists in Western lands who undertake to teach the rudiments of the Sacred Science to their disciples—those western Hierophants being often themselves ignorant of the danger they incur—one and all of these “Teachers”

156

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

are subject to the same inviolable law. From the moment they begin *really* to teach, from the instant they confer *any* power—whether psychic, mental or physical—on their pupils,

they take upon themselves *all* the sins of that pupil, in connection with the Occult Sciences, whether of omission or commission, until the moment when initiation makes the pupil a Master and responsible in his turn. There is a weird and mystic religious law, greatly revered and acted upon in the Greek, half-forgotten in the Roman Catholic, and absolutely extinct in the Protestant Church. It dates from the earliest days of Christianity and has its basis in the law just stated, of which it was a symbol and an expression. This is the dogma of the absolute sacredness of the relation between the god-parents who stand sponsors for a child.* These tacitly take upon themselves all the sins of the newly baptised child— (anointed, as at the initiation, a mystery truly!)—until the day when the child becomes a responsible unit, knowing good and evil. Thus it is clear why the "Teachers" are so reticent, and why "Chelas" are required to serve a seven years probation to prove their fitness, and develop the qualities necessary to the security of both Master and pupil.

Occultism is not magic. It is *comparatively* easy to learn the trick of spells and the methods of using the subtler, but still material, forces of physical nature; the powers of the animal soul in man are soon awakened; the forces which his love, his hate, his passion, can call into operation, are readily developed. But this is Black Magic— *Sorcery*. For it is the motive, *and the motive alone*, which makes any exercise of power become black, malignant, or white, beneficent Magic. It is impossible to employ *spiritual* forces if there is the slightest tinge of selfishness remaining in the operator. For, unless the intention is

* So holy is the connection thus formed deemed in the Greek Church, that a marriage between god-parents of the same child is regarded as the worst kind of incest, is considered illegal and is dissolved by law; and this absolute prohibition extends even to the children of one of the sponsors as regards those of the other.

entirely unalloyed, the spiritual will transform itself into the psychic, act on the astral plane, and dire results may be produced by it. The powers and forces of animal nature can equally be used by the selfish and revengeful, as by the unselfish and the all-forgiving; the powers and forces of spirit lend themselves only to the perfectly pure in heart—and this is DIVINE MAGIC.

What are then the conditions required to become a student of the "Divina Sapiencia"? For let it be known that no such instruction can possibly be given unless these certain conditions are complied with, and rigorously carried out during the years of study. This is a *sine qua non*. No man can swim unless he enters deep water. No bird can fly unless its wings are grown, and it has space before it and courage to trust itself to the air. A man who will wield a two-edged sword, must be a thorough master of the blunt weapon, if he would not injure himself—or what is worse—others, at the first attempt.

To give an approximate idea of the conditions under which alone the study of Divine Wisdom can be pursued with safety, that is without danger that Divine will give place to

Black Magic, a page is given from the “private rules,” with which every instructor in the East is furnished. The few passages which follow are chosen from a great number and explained in brackets.

1. The place selected for receiving instruction must be a spot calculated not to distract the mind, and filled with “influence-evolving” (magnetic) objects. The five sacred colours gathered in a circle must be there among other things. The place must be free from any malignant influences hanging about in the air.

[The place must be set apart, and used for no other purpose. The five “sacred colours” are the prismatic hues arranged in a certain way, as these colours are very magnetic. By “malignant influences” are meant any disturbances through strifes, quarrels, bad feelings, etc., as these are said to impress themselves immediately on the astral light, *i.e.*, in the atmosphere of the place, and to hang “about in the air.”

158

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

This first condition seems easy enough to accomplish, yet—on further consideration, it is one of the most difficult ones to obtain.]

2. Before the disciple shall be permitted to study “face to face,” he has to acquire preliminary understanding in a select company of other lay *upasakas* (disciples), the number of whom must be odd.

[“Face to face,” means in this instance a study independent or apart from others, when the disciple gets his instruction *face to face* either with himself (his higher, Divine Self) or—his guru. It is then only that each receives *his due* of information, according to the use he has made of his knowledge. This can happen only toward the end of the cycle of instruction.]

3. Before thou (the teacher) shalt impart to thy *Lanoo* (disciple) the good (holy) words of LAMRIN, or shall permit him “to make ready” for *Dubjed*, thou shalt take care that his mind is thoroughly purified and at peace with all, especially *with his other Selves*. Otherwise the words of Wisdom and of the good Law, shall scatter and be picked up by the winds.

[*Lamrin* is a work of practical instructions, by Tson-kha-pa, in two portions, one for ecclesiastical and exoteric purposes, the other for esoteric use.* “To make ready” for *Dubjed*, is to prepare the vessels used for seership such as mirrors and crystals. The “other selves,” refers to the fellow students. Unless the greatest harmony reigns among the learners, *no* success is possible. It is the teacher who makes the selections according to the magnetic and electric natures of the students, bringing together and adjusting most carefully the positive and the negative elements.]

4. The *upasaka* while studying must take care to be united as the fingers on one hand. Thou shalt impress upon their minds that whatever hurts one should hurt the others, and if

the rejoicing of one finds no echo in the breasts of the others, then the required conditions are absent, and it is useless to proceed.

* [*Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. Lamrin, for further data.—Compiler.*]

[This can hardly happen if the preliminary choice made was consistent with the magnetic requirements. It is known that chelas otherwise promising and fit for the reception of truth, had to wait for years on account of their temper and the impossibility they felt to put themselves *in tune* with their companions. For—]

5. The co-disciples must be tuned by the guru as the strings of a lute (*vina*) each different from the others, yet each emitting sounds in harmony with all. Collectively they must form a keyboard answering in all its parts to thy lightest touch (the touch of the Master). Thus their minds shall open for the harmonies of Wisdom, to vibrate as knowledge through each and all, resulting in effects pleasing to the presiding gods (tutelary or patron-angels) and useful to the Lanoo. So shall Wisdom be impressed for ever on their hearts and the harmony of the law shall never be broken.

6. Those who desire to acquire the knowledge leading to the *Siddhis* (occult powers) have to renounce all the vanities of life and of the world (here follows enumeration of the Siddhis).

7. None can feel the difference between himself and his fellow-students, such as “I am the wisest,” “I am more holy and pleasing to the teacher, or in my community, than my brother,” etc.—and remain an upasaka. His thoughts must be predominantly fixed upon his heart, chasing therefrom every hostile thought to any living being. It (the heart) must be full of the feeling of its non-separateness from the rest of beings as from all in Nature; otherwise no success can follow.

8. A *Lanoo* (disciple) has to dread external living influence alone (magnetic emanations from living creatures). For this reason while at one with all, in his *inner nature*, he must take care to separate his outer (external) body from every foreign influence: none must drink out of, or eat in his cup but himself. He must avoid bodily contact (*i.e.*, being touched or touch) with human, as with animal being.

[No pet animals are permitted and it is forbidden even to touch certain trees and plants. A disciple has to live, so to say, in his own atmosphere in order to individualize it for occult purposes.]

9. The mind must remain blunt to all but the universal truths in nature, lest the “Doctrine of the Heart” should become only the “Doctrine of the Eye” (*i.e.*, empty exoteric ritualism).

10. No animal food of whatever kind, nothing that has life in it, should be taken by the disciple. No wine, no spirits, or opium should be used; for these are like the *Lhamayin* (evil spirits), who fasten upon the unwary, they devour the understanding.

[Wine and Spirits are supposed to contain and preserve the bad magnetism of all the men who helped in their fabrication; the meat of each animal, to preserve the psychic characteristics of its kind.]

11. Meditation, abstinence in all, the observation of moral duties, gentle thoughts, good deeds and kind words, as good will to all and entire oblivion of Self, are the most efficacious means of obtaining knowledge and preparing for the reception of higher wisdom.

12. It is only by virtue of a strict observance of the foregoing rules that a Lanoo can hope to acquire in good time the Siddhis of the Arhats, the growth which makes him become gradually One with the UNIVERSAL ALL.

These 12 extracts are taken from among some 73 rules, to enumerate which would be useless as they would be meaningless in Europe. But even these few are enough to show the immensity of the difficulties which beset the path of the would-be “Upasaka,” who has been born and bred in Western lands.*

All western, and especially English, education is instinct with the principle of emulation and strife; each boy is urged to learn more quickly, to outstrip his companions,

* Be it remembered that *all* “Chelas,” even lay disciples, are called Upasaka until after their first initiation, when they become lanoo-Upasaka. To that day, even those who belong to Lamaseries and are *set apart*, are considered as “laymen.”

and to surpass them in every possible way. What is miscalled “friendly rivalry” is assiduously cultivated and the same spirit is fostered and strengthened in every detail of life.

With such ideas “educated into” him from his childhood, how can a Westerner bring himself to feel towards his co-students “as the fingers on one hand”? Those co-students, too, are not of his *own selection*, or chosen by himself from personal sympathy and appreciation. They are chosen by his teacher on far other grounds, and he who would be a student must *first* be strong enough to kill out in his heart all feelings of dislike and

antipathy to others. How many Westerners are ready even to attempt this in earnest?

And then the details of daily life, the command not to touch even the hand of one's nearest and dearest. How contrary to Western notions of affection and good feeling! How cold and hard it seems. Egotistical too, people would say, to abstain from giving pleasure to others for the sake of one's own development. Well, let those who think so defer till another lifetime the attempt to enter the path in real earnest. But let them not glory in their own fancied unselfishness. For, in reality, it is only the seeming appearances which they allow to deceive them, the conventional notions, based on emotionalism and gush, or so-called courtesy, things of the unreal life, not the dictates of Truth.

But even putting aside these difficulties, which may be considered "external," though their importance is none the less great, how are students in the West to "attune themselves" to harmony as here required of them? So strong has personality grown in Europe and America that there is no school of artists even whose members do not hate and are not jealous of each other. "Professional" hatred and envy have become proverbial; men seek each to benefit himself at all costs, and even the so-called courtesies of life are but a hollow mask covering these demons of hatred and jealousy.

In the East the spirit of "non-separateness" is inculcated as steadily from childhood up, as in the West the

spirit of rivalry. Personal ambition, personal feelings and desires, are not encouraged to grow so rampant there. When the soil is naturally good, it is cultivated in the right way, and the child grows into a man in whom the habit of subordination of one's lower to one's higher Self is strong and powerful. In the West men think that their own likes and dislikes of other men and things are guiding principles for them to act upon, even when they do not make of them the law of their lives and seek to impose them upon others.

Let those who complain that they have learned little in the Theosophical Society lay to heart the words written in an article in *The Path* for last February:—"The key in each degree is the *aspirant himself*." * It is not "the fear of God" which is "the beginning of Wisdom," but the knowledge of SELF which is WISDOM ITSELF.

How grand and true appears, thus, to the student of Occultism who has commenced to realize some of the foregoing truths, the answer given by the Delphic Oracle to all who came seeking after Occult Wisdom—words repeated and enforced again and again by the wise Socrates—MAN KNOW THYSELF. . . .

* [*The Path*, Vol. II, No. 11, February, 1888, p. 330, where William Quan Judge, writing under the pseudonym of William Brehon, analyses the Second Chapter of the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ*. Speaking of the original school of initiation upon this earth, he says: "It is secret, because, founded in nature and having only real Hierophants at the head, its privacy cannot be invaded without the real key. And that key, in each degree, is the *aspirant himself*. Until that aspirant has become in fact the sign and the key, he cannot enter the degree above him. As a whole then, and in each degree, it is self-protective."—*Compiler*.]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

CORRESPONDECE

163

CORRESPONDENCE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 8, April, 1888, pp. 155-160]

To the Editors of *Lucifer*.

As you invite questions, I take the liberty of submitting one to your consideration.

Is it not to be expected (basing one' reasoning on Theosophical teaching) that the meeting and intercourse in Kama-loka of persons truly attached to each other must be fraught with disappointment, nay frequently even with deep grief? Let me illustrate my meaning by an example:

A mother departs this life twenty years before her son, who, deeply attached to her, longs to meet her again, and only finds her "shell," from which all those spiritual qualities have fled which to him were the essential part of the being he loved. Even the "shell" itself, by its resemblance to the former body, only adds to his grief by keeping early memories more vividly alive, and showing him the vast difference between the entity he knew on earth and the remnant he finds.

Or take a second case:

The son meets his mother in Kama-loka after a short separation, only to find her entity in a state of disintegration, as her pure spirit has already begun to leave her astral body and to ascend towards Devachan. He has to witness this process of gradual dissolution, and day by day he feels his mother's spirit slip away whilst his more material nature prevents him from joining in her rapid progress.

I subjoin my name and address, though not for publication, and remain,

Very truly yours,
"F. T. S."

EDITORS' REPLY.—Our Correspondent seems to have been misled as to the state of consciousness which entities experience in Kama-loka. He seems to have formed his conceptions on the visions of *living* psychics and the revelations of *living* mediums. But all conclusions drawn from such data are vitiated by the fact, that a *living* organism intervenes between the observer and the Kama-loka state *per se*. There can be no *conscious* meeting in Kama-loka, hence no grief. There is no astral disintegration *pari passu* with the separation of the shell from the spirit.

164

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

According to the Eastern teaching the state of the deceased in Kama-loka is not what we, living men, would recognise as "conscious." It is rather that of a person stunned and

dazed by a violent blow, who has momentarily “lost his senses.” Hence in Kama-loka there is as a rule (apart from vicarious life and consciousness awakened through contact with mediums) no *recognition* of friends or relatives, and therefore such a case as stated here is impossible.

We meet those we loved only in Devachan, that subjective world of perfect bliss, the state which succeeds the Kama-loka, after the separation of the principles. In Devachan all our personal, unfulfilled *spiritual* desires and aspirations will be realised; for we shall not be living in the hard world of matter but in those subjective realms wherein a desire finds its instant realisation; because man himself is there a god and a creator.

In dealing with the dicta of psychics and mediums, it must always be remembered that they translate, automatically and unconsciously, their experiences on any plane of consciousness, into the language and experience of our normal physical plane. And this confusion can only be avoided by the special study-training of occultism, which teaches how to trace and guide the passage of impressions from one plane to another and fix them on the memory.

Kama-loka may be compared to the dressing-room of an actor, in which he divests himself of the costume of the last part he played before rebecoming himself properly—the immortal *Ego* or the Pilgrim cycling in his Round of Incarnations. The Eternal Ego being stripped in Kama-loka of its lower terrestrial principles, with their passions and desires, it enters into the state of Devachan. And therefore it is said that only the purely spiritual, the nonmaterial emotions, affections, and aspirations accompany the Ego into that state of Bliss. But the process of stripping off the lower, the fourth and part of the fifth, principles is an unconscious one in all normal human beings. It is only in very exceptional cases that there is a slight return to consciousness in Kama-loka: and this is the case of very materialistic unspiritual personalities, who, devoid of the

conditions requisite, cannot enter the state of absolute Rest and Bliss.

To the Editors of *Lucifer*.

As a very new member of the Theosophical Society I have jotted down a few points which appear to me to be worthy of your notice.

(1) What books do you specially advise to be read in connection with *Esoteric Buddhism*? And any remarks upon them.

(2) Have the Adepts grown or developed to their present state and powers by their own inherent capacities? If so how far can the steps of the process be described?

(3) What is known of the training of the Yogees?

(4) What is known of the Root-races of man of which we are said to be the fifth?

(5) What are Elementals—their nature, powers and communication with man?

(6) In what light are Theosophists to regard the whole *account* in the late republication of the T.P.S. of

the marriage of the Spirit daughter of Colonel Eaton with the Spirit son of Franklin Pearce?!

(7) In the Articles on “The Esoteric Character of the Gospels” I observe that as yet no notice has been taken of Prophecy and its alleged fulfilment in Jesus Christ. I have read these with intense interest, and regret that I was unable to obtain the first two numbers of *Lucifer*.

I am, Yours truly,
J. M.

EDITORS’ REPLY:—(1) *Five Years of Theosophy*, or better the back numbers of *The Theosophist*, and *The Path*, also *Light on the Path*.

When the general outlines have been mastered, other books can be recommended; but it must always be borne in mind that with *very* few exceptions *all books on these subjects are the works of students, not of Masters*, and must therefore be studied with caution and a well-balanced mind. All *theories* should be tested by the reason and not accepted *en bloc* as revelation.

(2) The process and growth of the Adepts is the secret of Occultism. Were adeptship easy of attainment many would achieve it, but it is the hardest task in nature, and

volumes would be required even to give an outline of the philosophy of this development. (See “Practical Occultism,” in this number.)

(3) Nothing but what they give out themselves—which is very little. Read Patañjali’s *Yoga Philosophy*; but with *caution*, for it is very apt to mislead, being written in symbolic language. Compare the article on “Sankhya and Yoga Philosophy” in *The Theosophist* for March.*

(4) Wait for H. P. Blavatsky’s forthcoming work: *The Secret Doctrine*.

(5) See *The Secret Doctrine*, also *Isis Unveiled*, and various articles in *The Theosophist*, especially “About the Mineral Monad” (also reprinted in *Five Years of Theosophy*).†

(6) The account referred to was quoted to show how absurdly materialistic are the common ideas, even among intelligent Spiritualists, of the post-mortem states. It was intended to bring home vividly the unphilosophical character, and the hopeless inadequacy, of such conceptions.

(7) The subject of “Prophecy” may be dealt with in a future article of the series; but the questions involved are too irritating to the casual Christian reader, too important and need too much bibliographical research, to permit of their continuation from month to month.

To the Editors of *Lucifer*.

In the last issue of *Lucifer* is a paper “Self-Evident Truths and Logical Deductions.” The paper is important, but is not, in my opinion, sufficiently clear. “*One is a Unity* and cannot be divided into two Ones.” This is so if we understand Unity to be *many* entities, parts, or forms, organised into a body of harmony so

forming a Unity.

* [Vol. IX, No. 102, March, 1888, pp. 342-56. Lecture read by the Secretary, Mr. A. J. Cooper-Oakley, before the Convention of The Theosophical Society, Adyar, December, 1887.—*Compiler.*]

† [*Vide* Volume V (1883), pp. 171-75, of the present Series.—*Compiler.*]

CORRESPONDENCE

167

I would like to ask, if the Universe, the One or All, must not be of a certain size; and if so, is the Original One, the ever produced, not of the same size?

Also, being an organic Whole, what is the form of the All? And is the form, whatever it is, not also the form of the self-existent Cause or God?

Is nature co-eternal with God? Or was there a time, or rather state, when God, the self-existent One, was all in all, before nature was produced from himself? I cannot think of anything of nature, spirit, soul, or God, without the ideas of size, form, number, and relation. So there can be no Life, Law, Cause, or Force, formless in itself, yet causative of forms. All evolutions are in, by, and unto forms; the All-evolver is Himself all Form.

The truth of the Universe is the Form of the Universe. The Truth of God is the Form of God. What Form is that? To attain to that is the great attainment for the intelligence at least. In these few lines my aim is mainly an enquiry.

Respectfully yours,
J. W. HUNTER.

Edinburgh, 29th March, 1888.

EDITORS' REPLY.—According to the Eastern philosophy a unity composed of “many entities, parts, or forms” is a compound unity on the plane of *Maya*—illusion or ignorance. The One universal divine Unity cannot be a differentiated whole, however much “organized into a body of harmony.” Organization implies external work out of materials at hand, and can never be connected with the self-existent, eternal, and unconditioned Absolute Unity.

This ONE SELF, absolute intelligence and existence, therefore *non-intelligence* and *non-existence* (to the finite and conditioned perception of man), is “*impartite*, beyond the range of speech and thought and is the substract of all” teaches *Vedantasara* in its introductory Stanza.

How, then, can the *Infinite* and the *Boundless*, the unconditioned and the *absolute*, be of any *size*? The question can only apply to a dwarfed reflection of the uncreate ray on the *mayavic* plane, or our phenomenal Universe; to one of the *finite Elohim*, who was most probably in the mind of our correspondent. To the (philosophically) untrained Pantheist, who identifies the objective Kosmos with the

abstract Deity, and for whom Kosmos and Deity are synonymous terms, the form of the illusive objectivity must be the form of that Deity. To the (philosophically) trained Pantheist, the abstraction, or the *noumenon*, is the ever to be unknown Deity, the one eternal reality, formless, because homogeneous and *impartite*; boundless, because Omnipresent—as otherwise it would only be a contradiction in ideas not only in terms; and the concrete phenomenal form—its *vehicle*—no better than an aberration of the ever-deceiving physical senses.

“Is nature co-eternal with God?” It depends on what is meant by “nature.” If it is objective phenomenal nature, then the answer is—though ever latent in divine Ideation, but being only periodical as a manifestation, it cannot be co-eternal. But “abstract” nature and Deity, or what our correspondent calls “Self-existent cause or God,” are inseparable *and even identical*. Theosophy objects to the masculine pronoun used in connection with the Self-existent Cause, or Deity. It says IT—inasmuch as that “Cause” the *rootless root* of all—is neither male, female, nor anything to which an attribute—something always conditioned, finite, and limited—can be applied. The confession made by our esteemed correspondent that he “cannot think of anything of nature, spirit[!], soul or God [!!] without the ideas of size, form, number, and relation,” is a living example of the sad spirit of anthropomorphism in this age of ours. It is this theological and dogmatic anthropomorphism which has begotten and is the legitimate parent of materialism. If once we realize that form is merely a temporary perception dependent on our physical senses and the idiosyncrasies of our physical brain and has no existence, *per se*, then this illusion that formless cause cannot be *causative of forms* will soon vanish. To think of Space in relation to any limited area, basing oneself on its three dimensions of length, breadth, and thickness, is strictly in accordance with mechanical ideas; but it is inapplicable in metaphysics and transcendental philosophy. To say then that “The Truth of God is the Form of God,” is to ignore even the exotericism of the Old Testament. “And the Lord spake unto you *out of the*

midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude. . . .” (Deut., iv, 12). And to think of the All-Evolver as something which has “size, form, number, and relation,” *is to think of a finite and conditioned personal God*, a part only of the ALL. And in such case, why should this part be better than its fellow-parts? Why not believe in Gods—the other rays of the All-Light? To say—“Among the gods who is like Thee O Lord” does not make the God so addressed really “the god of gods” or any better than his fellow-gods; it simply shows that every nation made a god of its own, and then, in its great ignorance and superstition, served and flattered and tried to propitiate that god. Polytheism on *such* lines, is more rational and philosophical than anthropomorphous monotheism.

To the Editors of *Lucifer*.

Several questions have of late occurred to me at the entry of the subject of Theosophy. . . . I am quite new to the study, and must perforce express myself crudely. I gather that an early result of entire devotion to an inner contemplative life, and a life also of fine unselfishness, such a life as is calculated to allow of the growth of faculties otherwise dormant, that a result of this life will be a growing recognition of the underlying unity of man and his surroundings, that to such a man truth will make itself known *from within*, and therefore will claim instant acceptance and unquestionable certitude; that in fact the longer that such a life is lived with unfading enthusiasm, the higher will the central spirit rise in self-assertion, the wider will be the survey of creation, and the more immediate the apprehension of truth; also that with these tends to develop a greater physical command of the forces of nature.

Now I submit that such a life as is here spoken of, *is* led by men who attain to none of these results. Most of us know Christians who seem never to have a selfish thought, who exist in an atmosphere of self-sacrifice for others, and whose leisure is all spent in meditation and in emotional prayer, which surely is seeking after truth. Yet they do not attain it. They fail to rise out of Christianity into Theosophy; they remain for ever limited to, and satisfied with the narrow space they move in. (1) It may be replied that they do expand slowly. Granted, for some of them. But my point is that there do exist (and one is enough for my purpose) men, and particularly women, leading lives both of spiritual meditation and of

170

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

unselfishness, to whom nevertheless is not vouchsafed a clearer view of the great universe, a larger apprehension of Theosophic truth, nor any increased physical command of nature.

(2) As regards the last point, take for an example John Stuart Mill. Surely he lived always in the white light of exalted contemplation and instant readiness of high unselfishness; yet to him came no dawn of Theosophic light, nor any larger hold upon the forces of material nature. (3) May I ask now for a word of explanation on this point? I apologise for the trouble I give, and for my want of ability in unfolding my difficulty.

H.C.

EDITORS' REPLY.—(1) Nowhere in the theosophic teachings was it stated that a life of entire devotion to one's duty alone, or "a contemplative life," graced even by "fine unselfishness" was sufficient in itself to awaken dormant faculties and lead man to the apprehension of final truths, let alone spiritual powers. To lead such life is an excellent and meritorious thing, under any circumstances, whether one be a Christian or a Mussulman, a Jew, Buddhist or Brahmin, and according to Eastern philosophy it must and will benefit a person, if not in his present, then in his future existence on earth, or what we call *rebirth*. But to expect that leading the best of lives helps one—without the help of philosophy and esoteric wisdom—to perceive "the soul of things" and develops in him "a physical command of the forces of nature," *i.e.*, endows him with abnormal or adept powers—is really too sanguine. Less than by any one else can such results be achieved by a sectarian of whatever exoteric creed. For the path to which his meditation is confined, and upon which his contemplation travels, is too narrow, too thickly covered with the weeds of dogmatic beliefs—the fruits of human fancy and error—to permit the pure ray of any Universal truth to shine upon it. His is a blind faith, and when his eyes open he has to give it up and cease being a "Christian" in the theological sense. The instance is not a good one.

It is like pointing to a man immersed in “holy” water in a bathtub and asking why he has not learnt to swim in it, since he is sitting in such holy fluid. Moreover, “unfading *enthusiasm*” and “*emotional prayer*” are not exactly the conditions required for

the achievement of true theosophic and spiritual development. These means can at best help to *psychic* development. If our correspondent is anxious to learn the difference between *Spiritual* and *Psychic* wisdom, between *Sophia* and *Psyche*, let him turn to the Greek text (the English translation is garbled) in the *Epistle of James*, iii, 15-16, and he will know that one is *divine* and the other terrestrial, “sensual devilish.”

(2) The same applies to the second case in hand, and even to the third.

(3) Both—*i.e.*, persons in general, leading lives of spiritual meditation, and those who like John Stuart Mill live “always in the white light of exalted contemplation,” do not pursue truth in the right direction, and therefore they fail; moreover John Stuart Mill set up for himself an arbitrary standard of truth, inasmuch as he made his *physical* consciousness the final court of appeal. His was a case of a wonderful development of the intellectual and terrestrial side of psyche or soul, but Spirit he rejected as all Agnostics do. And how can any final truths be apprehended except by the Spirit, which is the only and eternal reality in Heaven as on Earth?

A lady writes from America:

In the fourth number of *Lucifer* on page 328* are the words:

“Enough has been given out at various times regarding the conditions of post-mortem existence, to furnish a solid block of information on this point.”

The writer would be glad to be told where this information may be found. Is it in print? Or must one be Occultist enough to find it out in the “Symbology” of the Bible for himself?

“ONE WHO HUNGERS FOR SOME OF THIS KNOWLEDGE.”

It is certainly necessary to be an “Occultist” before the post-mortem states of man can be correctly understood

* [December, 1887. Vide p. 299 of Vol. VIII in the present Series.—*Compiler.*]

and realised, for this can only be accomplished through the actual experience of one who has the faculty of placing his consciousness on the Kamalokic and Devachanic planes. But a good deal has been given out in *The Theosophist*. Much also can be learnt from the symbology not only of the Bible but of all religions, especially the Egyptian and the Hindu. Only again the key to that symbology is in the keeping of the Occult Sciences and their Custodians.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**

April, 1888

WOMAN: HER GLORY, HER SHAME, AND HER GOD

[REVIEW]

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 8, April, 1888, pp. 161-62; and Vol. III,
No. 13, September, 1888, pp. 81 -82]

[The work under review is from the pen of "Saladin," who was William Stewart Ross (1844- 1906). It was published in two volumes by W. Stewart & Co., London. H.P.B. had a very high respect and admiration for the writer. As the two volumes of this work appeared at some interval from each other, her separate reviews were published at separate times. We reprint them together, for the sake of completeness.]

The title of the above work is scarcely suggestive of Anti-Christian polemics, despite the fact that it emanates from the pen of so determined an iconoclast as Mr. Stewart Ross. The casual reader might expect to meet with some eulogy of the fair sex, dissociated from theological considerations. Such, however, is not the case. The neat volume before us contains one of the most powerful attacks on the practical ethics of Christianity which it has ever been our lot to peruse. Mr. Ross is clearly of the opinion that a tree must be judged by its fruits, and in demolishing the romantic and chivalrous aspect of the history of woman in Christendom by the hard reality of fact and logic, he unhesitatingly condemns the whole fabric of orthodox theology as hopelessly rotten. Taking as his text the well-known, and perhaps reprehensible, statement of



ANNIE BESANT IN 1885

Archdeacon Farrar to the effect that Christianity “has elevated the woman; it shrouds as with a halo of innocence the tender years of the child,” the author tests its validity by an appeal to church and secular history, exposing the abominations of priestly vice in the Middle Ages and ruthlessly unmasking the darker aspects of modern life. He rightly scorns to pander to a spurious sentiment of delicacy, and does not hesitate to penetrate into the very arcana of vice when the necessities of his task demand it. The prurience of the Christian Fathers, the debaucheries of Inquisitors, the shameless prostitution of “Religion” to depravity which is noticeable in ancient and even in modern times, the indirect manner in which unfortunate passages in the Bible—interpolations let us hope—have ministered to the lust of bigots and fanatics, the fatal effects of “faith” and emotionalism in worship, all these things, and many more, are dealt with in a most forcible manner. The author’s facts are unimpeachable, his criticism scathing, but the general conclusions which he draws from them are not always of a nature to command the acceptance of even the most resolute of liberal thinkers.

For instance, when he states that “the *essential essence* of Christianity is opposed to that deliberate and judicial self-restraint which forms the barrier against licentiousness” (p. 77), he is, in our opinion, carried too far by the vehemence of a just revolt against the moral atrocities which have rendered theology such a mockery in the past. The “faith” to which he alludes as so pernicious to mental stability has its darker side; but it has also illumined, however irrationally, the lives of thousands of noble men and women. Similarly, in his anxiety to shift the whole burden of sexual depravity of Europe on to the back of Christianity, he extends his generalisation too freely. It has been remarked by many writers that the ghastly immoralities of ecclesiastical history are chargeable *to individuals*, not to the system itself. Vice must have had its outlet somehow, and all it needed was—opportunity. Consequently Mill and others have declined to regard the vices which spring up in the course of religious history as indicative of anything more than the necessary outcome of

human evolution. Nations mould their religion, not *vice versa*. With the ennobling of human ideas, a gradual metamorphosis of creeds must ensue.

Consequently, instead of holding that the degradation of woman by priests and religionists is in itself a condemnation of the creed they profess, it would be more correct to put the truth thus: Christianity has done nothing to exalt woman, but has, on the contrary, *retarded her progress*. Mr. Ross’ position would be, then, very difficult to assail.

If, however, he ascribes her treatment in the earlier centuries to the influence of Christianity, to what does he attribute her gradual promotion in the social scale? To the same cause, or to the slow amelioration of human knowledge and culture since the Renaissance? We question very much whether creeds are responsible for all the horrors usually ascribed to their domination. Practical life and practical belief are rather *mirrors* of a nation's intellectual status than arbitrary facts which represent independent realities. Christianity has delayed human progress, rather than introduced a new noxious agency. It has, moreover, a distinctly fair side, *viz.*:—in largely contributing to render International Law possible by cementing together the peoples of Europe. Impartial Freethinkers, such as Lecky and others, have shown clearly enough that the pros and cons are balanced after all. To-day, of course, the system is out of date; it has served a certain beneficial end in the economy of life, and achieved a reputation like that of Byron's *Corsair*:—

Linked with one virtue, and a thousand crimes.*

It is this tissue of a “thousand crimes” which, in our author's words, makes his task—

A hideous one but I stand in desperate conflict against overwhelming imposture and a worldful of sham and cant and falsehood you may count all the real writers on the fingers of one hand, who are striving to do what I am striving to do. My purpose is too tremendous for me to bathe myself in perfumes, array myself

* [*The Corsair: A Tale*, Canto III, Stanza xxiv, last line.]

with ribbons, and with a debonair smile and a light rapier, parry with the dilettante grace of a fencing master. With both hands I grasp the hilt of a claymore notched with clanging blows upon helmet and hauberk and red with the stains of battle, and thrust straight at the throat of the Old Dragon, fenced around by a hundred thousand pulpits and armed to the teeth with a panoply of lies.

In conclusion we need only say that the student will find much of great value in Mr. Ross' book. It is sparkling, brimful of wit and interest, and interspersed with passages of the most eloquent declamation. Altogether the author has produced a contribution to aggressive free-thought literature well worthy of his great reputation, and still greater talent.

[REVIEW OF VOL. II]

In the above volume Saladin prosecutes the campaign against Christianity to which he

has devoted the larger part of his literary work. Readers of *Lucifer* will recall the recent review of the previous volume of the book in these columns, and the favourable criticisms which this brilliant writer then evoked. We have now simply to endorse that verdict, and, although unable to agree with the extreme conclusions occasionally arrived at by Mr. Ross, we cannot but see in the terrible indictment before us an impeachment of Christian morality which admits of no answer. Christian ethics and Christian *practice* are exposed and satirized with merciless severity, and the reader is confronted with a vast array of facts bearing on “modern civilization” which show the *total inadequacy* of present creeds to grapple with the vices and brutality of man. *Woman* is never dull; it is, on the contrary, so sparkling and versatile as to throw a charm even over the most plain-spoken passages where English impurity is brought to light. But let no reader of a pharisaical or fastidious turn of mind peruse his work. Saladin is a pure-minded and high-souled writer, but he stops at no revelation when he intends to prove his case. The annals of vice are deliberately sifted—from the *support*

and legalization of prostitution by the English *Christian* Government in the East down to the revolting secrets of “modern Babylon” at home. The exposure is not pleasant reading, it reads far worse than anything penned by Tacitus regarding Rome vice under the emperors, but it is unfortunately true. “And yet,” writes the author, after unveiling one hideous sore, “the pulpit and the religious press are possessed of sufficient ignorance [?] and effrontery to declare that Christianity has exalted the status of woman and sweetened and purified the atmosphere of social and domestic life.” To writers of this sort *Woman* will prove a very efficient eye-opener.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

VISIONS

[REVIEW]

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 8, April, 1888, pp. 164-165]

[The author of this small book is Rev. Wm. Stainton Moses, who wrote under the pseudonym of "M. A. Oxon." The review is unsigned, but the manner in which the subject-matter is treated suggests H.P.B.'s authorship. It contains several important keys of a psycho-spiritual nature.]

In his *Introduction* to this little pamphlet, "M. A. Oxon." strikes the key-note of his Visions. They are "teaching" or "instruction" to those whose wants they meet. In saying this, the author has, perhaps unwittingly, expressed a great fact, *i.e.*, that for each one of us *that is truth* which meets our greatest need—whether moral, intellectual or emotional. As the author seems to feel, it matters very little whether these visions were subjective or objective. They conveyed to him certain moral truths with a directness and vividness which no other method of teaching could have attained. And whether we consider that these "Visions" were the thoughts of the intelligence teaching him impressed and objectivised in the recipient's brain; or whether we think that in these visions the seer beheld

VISIONS

177

objective things—does not in any way alter their value as expressions of subtle truth. In many respects they resemble the visions seen by Swedenborg, and they share with the writings of that wonderful man the same curious personal colouring or shaping of the form in which they are cast, in accordance with the intellectual views and beliefs held by the seer.

The "Visions" are instructive from several points of view. They offer a curious study to the student of psychology, who will trace in them the various elements due to the Seer and to the influences acting upon him. To the man in search of moral light, they will express truths of the inner life, known and recorded in many forms during the past ages of man's life-history. They teach most impressively the cardinal doctrine of that inner life, *viz.*, that man is absolutely his own creator. To the student of practical psychic development, they speak of the difficulties which attend the opening of the psychic senses, of the difficulty of distinguishing between the creation of man's own imagination and the more permanent creations of nature.

There is a pathetic touch here and there, bringing out clearly the difficulties just

mentioned. The seer longs for the personal contact of earth and is told “to leave the personal.” How long will it be before this, the deepest truth of Theosophy, is in any sense realised even by such seers as M. A. Oxon?

The clinging to personality is so strong that it is felt even in another state of consciousness. How then can it fail to colour and distort the pure truth, which is and must be absolutely impersonal? But this lesson is one hard to learn, so hard that many lives suffice not even for its comprehension.

The statements on page 21 would seem to show that the visions recorded are those of the Devachanic state. For it [is] said that all the scenery and surroundings, the natural world of that plane in short, are the creations of the particular spirit with whose sphere the seer is in contact. This coincides perfectly with the Theosophic view, and when once this truth is really grasped, Spiritualists will realise how mistaken they have been in attacking a doctrine

which is in reality what they have so long been seeking for, and which offers them the logical and philosophic system which they need as a basis for their investigations.

The beauty of the thoughts expressed in the pages of this little book is very striking, and although the author expressly disclaims any literary merit, no one can fail to recognise the ability and truthfulness of expressions which characterise the work. All students will assuredly be grateful to M. A. Oxon for rendering these “Visions” easily accessible.

[Col. Henry S. Olcott reviewed the same work in *The Theosophist*, Vol. IX, May, 1888, pp. 505-06. He pointed out that these “Visions” of Rev. Wm. Stainton Moses were the record of his psychic experiences on the 4th, 5th and 6th of September, 1877, during which he was instructed on the *post-mortem* condition of man by what appeared to him to be an outside agency of high degree of evolution and knowledge. Col. Olcott especially stresses the teaching regarding the nature of the after-death consciousness, and the fact that its world is of its own creation. He illustrates this point by saying: “In the course of my psychical researches I was once so fortunate as to be for a short time in literary collaboration with a noble English scholar who died several generations ago. He worked in a vast subjective library in ‘his castle in Spain,’ without a thought of rising higher towards *Samadhi*, but with all his vast intellectual power bent upon the pursuit of the philosophical study to which his earth-life had been devoted. . . .”

This interesting statement has reference to the English Platonist Henry More (1614-1687), whose collaboration in the production of *Isis Unveiled* is fully described by Col. Olcott in his *Old Diary Leaves*, Vol. I, chap. xv. In the same work, chapters xviii, xix and xx, contain a considerable amount of interesting data concerning Rev. Wm. Stainton Moses or Moseyn, and the earnest student would do well to peruse them with close attention.— *Compiler*.]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

REPLY TO MADAME BLAVATSKY'S OBSERVATIONS

179

REPLY TO MADAME BLAVATSKY'S OBSERVATIONS ON CHRISTIAN ESOTERICISM*

[*Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. II, No. II, February, 1888, pp. 258-271]

[*Translated from the original French*]

I.—There are some men whom nothing can discourage and nothing cast down, because they have *faith*, faith critically examined, scientifically established. I am one of those.

Far from complaining of the “drubbing” I have received under the guise of a hearty reception, and as a testimony of welcome, upon my first appearance in *Le Lotus*, on the contrary, I am gratified by Madame Blavatsky's courteous manner and the complete frankness of her language. In my eyes, these are evidences of her sincerity and cordiality, the less equivocal the more forthrightly given. No one would suspect this lady of toadyism with respect to Catholic priests—usually so readily cajoled, and for good reasons, in Ultramontane circles (*Ultramundane*, some would say), where the religion of Christ has all to lose and nothing to gain. I am indebted, very greatly indebted, to her virile intellect, her Amazonian gait and her unceremonious pen, for presenting at the very outset the burning question of Christ “with a masculine vigor,” as the Editor remarks, and also, “without ambiguity and without partisanship.”

Without partisanship hum! We shall see. It may happen as it often does, that partisanship exists without one suspecting it oneself. We deceive ourselves so easily! It is so difficult to rid oneself of all personal interest, and, still more, of all partisanship of school, sect, church, caste, etc.!

It is not then without reason that Jesus Christ said: “Deny yourselves, and do not swear by any Master, so that you may hold only to the pure Truth.” † In his own terms, quite as categorical as those of the Mahârâjâs of Benares, our Christ also declared: “There is no religion higher than Truth.” We shall soon see how he expressed himself on this point.

Now Madame Blavatsky, and with her the Chelas and the Theosophists, have taken unto themselves Masters, the Mahâtmas. They

* [In spite of its earlier date, it has been thought advisable to have this essay of Abbé Roca appear at this particular place, as it has a direct connection with H. P. B.'s Reply which immediately follows it.

—*Compiler.*]

† [Paraphrase of *Matt.*, v, 34.—*Compiler*]

make no secret of it, and I do not blame them. From what the Adepts tell us, it would seem that they are ready to offer themselves to the world in their turn as doctors and teachers. That they have many things to teach us, I have not the least doubt. In the article to which my learned interlocutor replies, I have not done otherwise than render my homage to their wisdom. But when, perhaps a little intoxicated by the heady fumes of these encomiums, the Editor of *Le Lotus* exclaims and tells me by nods and winks, “who loves us, follows us,” I answer: Patience; I should greatly desire *to love you* at first sight; it would be easy and, moreover, perfectly Christian. I should like to *follow you* also, but on sure grounds, *con pasos contados*, and with the knowledge of where I am going.

I find myself rather in the attitude of Aristotle; for me as for him, there is something which is of greater value than Plato, that is *Truth*. The phrase is well-known: “*Amicus Socrates, sed major Veritas*”! If then you are *Truth*, let us have it, but I must have absolute proof.

Before Madame Blavatsky, it happens that another presented himself to the world who said squarely, “I am the TRUTH—*Ego sum Veritas*”! He also told us: “Come unto me without fear, trust in my words, I am the Master, the *unique* Master, and the *only* true Doctor.” And again: “I am the *Way*, I am the *Life*, I am the *Resurrection*.”*

That is the language of Christ, and if it did not reveal God Himself, it would betray him as the most shameless of impostors. Now to say in the presence of Madame Blavatsky that Christ is an impostor should be carefully avoided, because she would reply with an outright smack on the mouth of the blasphemer. Draw your own conclusions, then.

You will agree, gentlemen, that the way in which Christ puts the matter is even more daring and more masculine than that of your noble Directress. Here, indeed, one can say it is done “without ambiguity and without partisanship,” without any personal interest of any kind and with perfect renunciation of self. The testimony in favour of it is such that it stares at you and takes complete possession of you. None can be ignorant of the fact that the life of Jesus Christ was spent in multiplying undeniable evidences of his disinterestedness, and that his death was the supreme confirmation of it, the 9"DJLD\" J,590D\"@L. Hence, overwhelmed by so many proofs, a very unlikely philosopher, J. J. Rousseau, once cried: “If the life and death of Socrates are those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus are those of a God!” Socrates exemplifies the highest and purest personification of virtue in the *West*, and I emphasize this because I agree that the *East* has seen incarnations of Wisdom superior to that which expressed itself in Socrates, and for that reason closer to that which was accomplished nineteen centuries ago in the Son of Mary. You see I am not niggardly over my admiration for India.

* [Paraphrases of passages from *John*, xi, 25 and xiv, 6.]

Further, it must be observed that Jesus Christ himself declares that it is impossible to show greater devotion to one’s brothers than that exemplified by sacrificing oneself entirely for them: *Nemo majorem Charitatem habet quam*, etc. * When any of the Mahâtmas—Jesus Christ was not one, whatever Madame Blavatsky may think—can convince me that he burns with such a love for us, that he came into the world to prove it and at the same time to bear witness to the Truth, that he himself is in substance this divine *Truth*, and the *Way* which leads thereto, and the *Life* which results from it, and the *Resurrection* which restores that *Truth* and that *Life* to our hearts when they have been extinguished in them; when he shall have demonstrated to me experimentally, as Jesus Christ does every day in my soul, “that he is the *unique* Master and *only* true Doctor,” that he is the *Light* that lightens all men, and the *Principle* at the base of our understanding—*Ego Principium qui loquor vobis*; when, moreover, to sustain these witnesses and an infinity of others no less extraordinary, he shall have agreed to drink from the chalice that Jesus drained at Gethsemane (a cup far more bitter than the one from which Socrates in the West drank the hemlock, or that from which Krishna,

Gautama of Kapilavastu, Siddhârtha and all the other Buddhas drank the bitterness in the East); when he shall, without complaint or murmur, *sicut agnus*, have delivered his body, *a planta pedis usque ad summum verticis*, † to the rods and whips of flagellation wielded to the uttermost by the arms of the soldiery and servants, his face to the bruising, the blows and the spitting of the mob, his head and forehead to the sharp pricking of the crown of thorns, his hands and feet to the nails and hammers of crucifixion, his lips parched by agony to the vinegar and bitterness of the abominable sponge, and, still more grievous, his life, a whole life woven of good deeds and blessings, to the denial of his own disciples, to the insults, the sarcasms, the blasphemies and curses of the priests and pontiffs of his time; when, finally, to all the fury of that diabolical sabbath, to all that outburst of frenzy, of iniquities and atrocious madness, he will reply only with that sublime prayer: “Father, forgive them for they know not what they do!” Then, oh yes, then! my dear brothers, I will do more than love you; I will follow you blindly, in a dumb adoration, abandoning all to you; as I have abandoned all to my divine Master and Saviour, Jesus Christ. For then He would be you, and you would be but *one* with the Father; then you would have lost the great illusion that is called *Ego-ism*, to unite yourselves, like Him, with Âtma-Christos, with the Ego, absolute, eternal, divine; then you would have realized, through the humble and suffering *Christ* of flesh, the Christ-Spirit, glorious and

* [The *Vulgate* text for *John*, xv, 13 is: “Majorem hac dilectionem memo habet, ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis suis.”—*Compiler*.]

† [*Isaiah*, i, 6.]

triumphant, and you would be able to exclaim with our incomparable Paul: “I live, but not so! it is not I who lives, it is Christ who lives in me! * *Vivo autem, iam non ego: vivit vero in me Christus!*”

II.—Ah! Believe me, Madame, the true Christians are not all dead with the last Gnostics, as you mistakenly declare. We have preserved, we also, even the Roman Church, however obscured and fallen it may be at this hour, that profound esotericism which is hidden under exoteric forms and uncomprehended dogmas, and which is found, nevertheless, under all religious symbols and all sacred traditions, in the West as well as in the East. If the sublime conception of that Christian ideal is that of the Mahâtmas, honour to them! But it is also that of the Kabalists and the true Catholics; I wish I could add of all the Theosophists, and of all the Occultists and of all the Hermetists.

Like yourself, Madame, we distinguish between the *PDFJ* of suffering and the *PDFJ* of glory, and we know that which you appear to be ignorant of, *i.e.*, that the *unction* refused by you to Jesus Christ has streamed upon him with the blood of his own immolation, because every sacrificed being is a being consecrated or *Christified*, and he is perfectly *annointed* who is completely offered in bloody holocaust. Nevertheless, you will agree with this, Madame, in recalling the Cycle of *initiation*: “No ‘sacrificial victim’,” you say rightly, “could be united to *Christ triumphant* before passing through the preliminary stage of the suffering Christ who was put to death.” Very good!

It is precisely to fulfil that ritualistic condition that “the Word made itself Flesh” according to St. John, and, consequently, that it becomes able, in our time, after nineteen centuries of crucifixion, to enter fully, before the whole world, into the divine light of the Christ-Spirit, because, as the wise Apostle of the Areopagus teaches, “Christ must suffer in order that he may enter into glory.”—“*oportuit Christum pati et ita intrare in gloriam.*” † The law is absolute, universal, it applies to Him who is the *head*, the *chief*, the “*Principium*” of mankind, and it applies also to each of the Monads, the cells or individual units of the universal social body of which that Christ is the *epigenetic principle*. None of us will enter that glorified body, which is to me the beatific Nirvâna of the Buddhists, without traversing that path which the Gospel calls the “strait gate and narrow way, *angusta porta, et arcta via*” [*Matt.*, vii, 14].

Madame Blavatsky may now see the true meaning of the conversion of St. Paul which she has not

understood. St. Paul was an initiate of the Essenian school of Gamaliel, a true Therapeut, a perfect Nazarene,

* [Paraphrase of Gal., ii, 20.—*Comp.*]

† [The *Vulgate* text for *Luke*, xxiv, 46 is: “Et dixit eis: Quoniam sic scriptum est, et sic oportebat Christum pati, et resurgere a mortuis tertia die.”—*Compiler.*]

REPLY TO MADAME BLAVATSKY’S OBSERVATIONS

183

as he tells us himself. He found himself precisely in the condition Madame Blavatsky apparently finds herself today, and where I fear some of the Chelas also are to be found. Like the majority of the Pharisees—which learned sect Paul gloried in following—he acknowledged the glorious Christ, he expected Him, but he did not recognize Him under the appearance of the sorrowful Son of Mary who so little resembled his ideal and that of the Synagogue, with his crown of thorns, his bleeding flesh, with the humiliation of his whole life, with the disconcerting ignominy of his allegedly infamous death.

Upon the road to Damascus it was given to Gamaliel’s disciple to discover his glorious Christ in the very person of the Christ veiled in flesh and suffering, in order to realize in his human body all that was ordained by the Law of Sacrifices, in the Cycle of Initiation of which Madame Blavatsky speaks. What was revealed to Paul was not by any means the Christos of the Gnostics, as she says, but really the Chrestos with all the arcana of his abasement and of his annihilation.

Also, listen to him on his return from Damascus: “I glorify myself not to know among you any other thing but Jesus Christ, and *Jesus-Christ crucified*.—*Nihil me scire glorior inter vos, nisi Jesum-Christum, et hunc crucifixum.*” *

Then, let us say in passing, the Apostle would have taken good care not “to make one mouthful of Saint Peter” as Madame Blavatsky says, because, long before Paul, Peter had deciphered the Arcana of the Passion, and he knew perfectly well that behind the bleeding Christ was hidden, in a kind of chrysalis, the Christ-Spirit, glorious and divine. The proof of this is in the Gospel itself. “What think ye of me?” Christ once asked his disciples. Peter alone answered: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” “*Credo quia tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi*” †—“Thou art happy, Simon-Bar-Jona, because thou sayest what has not been revealed to thy spirit by any man, but by the Father only.” Would that Madame Blavatsky could go to Damascus, and on her journey meet what Paul encountered there! In order to become a perfect initiate and the greatest of Christian Buddhists, that alone is lacking.

I do not deny that she is better versed in Hindû esotericism than I; but I doubt, after having given it careful consideration, that she is as well acquainted as I am with the Gospel esotericism. This is the reason, due entirely to her, why it is difficult to find ourselves in instant accord. I know Buddhism well enough to understand her easily; she

* [The text of the *Vulgate* for *I Cor.*, ii, 2 is: “Non enim judicavi, me scire aliquid inter vos, nisi Jesum Christum, et hunc crucifixum.” —*Compiler.*]

† [*Matt.*, xvi, 16.]

does not know Christianity sufficiently well to readily catch my meaning.

Otherwise, would she have dreamed of displaying so much erudition before me, and to remind me of the *astronomical allegory* and the *sidereal symbolism*, in which the priests of the ancient temples saw stereotyped in some fashion all the mysteries of Christianity? It is long since Dr Sepp, to refute Strauss and Dupuis, replied victoriously to the arguments brought against the historic Christ which were drawn from that astral legend. Thus, as that profound exegete remarks, Nature, the real dumb Sibyl, is so full of the Word which informs her that she delivers her oracles and unveils her secrets by means of all the Cosmic manifestations which occur in the subjects treated upon in our sciences; "*multifariam, multisque modis loquens nobis, etc.*"

To answer Madame Blavatsky on this point, I ought to do some plagiarizing, for I know nothing more definitive than what is written in the Introduction to Dr. Sepp's splendid *Life of Christ*, translated into French by M. Charles Sainte-Foi (a pseudonym of Éloi Jourdain).

I ask pardon of Madame Blavatsky and her readers for referring her and them to that fine monument of our Gnosis.

I have such faith in the progress of critical science that I never despair of anyone—still more of the high intelligences I am addressing at this moment.

Let us be content at present with the valuable declaration made by Madame Blavatsky, which is in agreement with her Masters, the Mahâtmas, namely, that behind the dogmatic formulas and sacramental veils of all the exoteric religions there is a supreme, absolute truth, an essentially divine Christianity, however diversely interpreted, and almost everywhere exploited. This alone is enough greatly to astonish our scholars, and especially to make our Church establishments as well as our Academies reflect! Let them work hard with their mattocks everywhere, for the bread of science demands even more sweat than material bread.

Yes, Priests, yes, scholars, one and the same Dogma is common to the East and to the West. "Theosophists," says Madame Blavatsky, "will bring to light the mysteries of the Catholic Church, *which are really those of the BrâhmaṢas*, although under other names." So may it be! My first article said enough of how I share in that hope, and this one does not contradict it.

III.—When Christ's suffering will have finished the redeeming and liberating work he came to do for us, and which appears to me to be nearing its end; when, thanks to Christian civilization and to the new sciences which are being inaugurated among us, when, I say, by favour of all these illuminations, the humble and suffering Christ "shall have been sufficiently exalted" in the understanding of the people redeemed by his blood, then, according to his own words, "*he will draw all to him, he will bear them to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God,*" and in

REPLY TO MADAME BLAVATSKY'S OBSERVATIONS

185

that ascension he will encompass the whole world: *Cum exaltatus fuero, omnia traham ad meipsum—ascendo ad Deum meum et Deum vestrum, ad Patrem meum et Patrem vestrum.*"*

Need we comment on this text? As you can see, it would be but to paraphrase the Law of Initiation, such as was formerly practised in the secrecy of the Temples, and such, I believe, as the Mahâtmas and Chelas still practice in their profound and holy retreats. When, by the purifying road of suffering, of expiation, and of death, Christ will be transfigured in the social structure, as he was once personally seen to be upon prophetic Tabor, to the extent that the sorrowful Christ will have become the triumphant Christ, through the sacrifice made to the absolute Ego of all that constitutes the relative Ego or Ego-ism, then, in truth, *Son of God* as He is from all Eternity, as the Word, equal to and consubstantial with the Father, according to the canonical Nicean expression, he will be recognized, acclaimed, glorified by the East as well as the West; then all the sanctuaries will again re-echo his *call*, the "general" salute on the drums will again be beaten, and the *réveille* of his Advent will sound from one end of the earth to the other.

Humanity, overthrowing the barriers which shut in and sectarianize the churches, will travel freely and peacefully toward the promised Sheepfold to constitute a universal family of the Father, under the unique

Shepherd's crook of a Shepherd who will be Christ Himself, visibly personified in a Pontiff who will no more resemble the Pope of today, than the Pope of Salt Lake resembles the real Pope of the Vatican.

Is what I say a prophecy? Not on your life. I am only repeating the Oracles, and what the words of the Messiah and St. Paul report. I am, at the most, a wretched phonograph repeating what is whispered to me from everywhere.

While waiting for these prophesies to be realized, believe me, do not be too greatly disturbed, do not be so dreadfully shocked, Madame, at the humility of our Christ! A great mystery, which is no longer one for many initiates, is hidden under his mortifications. Consider now!

In order to assume human nature, and thereby everyday human-hood, with all its individual monads, transitory and ceaselessly renewed on the earthly journey, Christ had to take on himself, in his flesh, all our wounds, all our miseries, all our personal and social infirmities,

* [This is a paraphrase of two distinct passages in the *Vulgate*, namely, *John*, xii, 32, and xx, 17; the first is: "Et ego, si exaltatus fuero a terra, omnia traham ad meipsum"; and the second is: "Dicit ei Jesus: Noli me tangere, nondum enim ascendi ad Patrem meum: vade autem ad fratres meos, et dic eis: Ascendo ad Patrem meum, et Patrem vestrum, Deum meum, et Deum vestrum."—*Compiler*.]

and to expiate them upon a cross in the streams of a virginal blood, absolutely pure in the Father's sight. To raise this fallen world, sunk lower in the West than in the East—and that is why the earth's axis is inclined, as you know—a lever was necessary. That lever, far more powerful than the one Archimedes asked for, is the *arm of Christ*, that arm which we call "the invincible right of the Father."

Under such a process Europe is evolving, is being morally uplifted; it awakens, it thrills, do you not see it? It grows, it mounts, soon it is going to find itself at the heights where Asia stands awaiting it. The Mahâtmas, their gaze fixed on us, have seen this ascensional movement operating in the turmoil of our revolutions, and they are saying to themselves: This is the psychological moment, let us hold out a hand to our poor brothers, and light our beacons in the midst of their darkness. And that is why, obeying the *mot-d'ordre* of the "Brothers," you have been able to establish 135 branches, which are so many centres of light, not only in Paris, but already in nearly every quarter of the globe. And when, by this means, the East and the West will have met each other and embraced, then, *Arcades ambo*, they will together take their glorious flight toward the Kingdom of Heaven realized on earth, and the divine Jerusalem contemplated by the Seer of Patmos will descend among us, to be occupied by men who will be as Gods, and by Gods who will be as men, even according to the saying of our Christ: *Ego dixi; vos Dii estis!* *

I am perfectly convinced that if, in my first article, I had been able to give my thoughts their full development—it really calls for a book, and that book will appear, as I am writing it—Madame Blavatsky would not imagine that I invited her and the Adepts to repair to the "Mountain of Salvation" by simply taking the road to Caesaro-Papal Rome, "where still the Satan of the Seven Hills reigns," to speak like Saint-Yves. She would have understood, on the contrary, that "we shall all have to take the trouble of travelling at the same pace on the route which leads to Meru."

This religious synthesis, and the social harmony and divine felicity which will result therefrom, will not be here on earth so soon, she says: "We are but at the beginning of Kali-Yuga, of which 5,000 years have not yet elapsed while its full duration is 4,320 centuries and it will only be at the end of the Cycle that the Kalkî-Avatâra will come." I do not deny that. Alas! I even believe she is right; I am not competent to judge in the matter. But, well-founded or not, those calculations are not going to contradict what she calls my "optimistic hope."

As for me, I have simply wished to speak of the epoch when, thanks to the progress accomplished among us by religious economy, and the

* [The text of the *Vulgate* for *John*, x, 34 is: “Respondit eis Jesus: Nonne scriptum est in lege vestra: Quia ego dixi, dii estis ?”—*Compiler*.]

Christian civilization that we owe to the diffusion of the *entirely new Spirit* of our Holy Gospel, it will become possible to overthrow these obstacles, I mean the mountains of error, of prejudices and passions, which have hitherto prevented the East and the West appreciating and listening to each other. These obstacles, these barriers, as everyone understands today, are the political work of Caesar. All our misfortunes come to us from that monster, who is the Satan of whom our Parables speak. Witness Jesus Himself on that point.

But first, I must remind you of the cry of triumph that, like a clarion cry of the morning watchman, echoed four years ago in the centre of Paris: “In the twentieth century war will be dead, frontiers will be dead, armies will be dead, Caesars will be dead” and the rest. An immense multitude, assembled at the Château-d’Eau, quivered with enthusiasm under the fiery breath of that prophetic Word, and the echoes sent that emotion far and wide. Shall it be said that Victor Hugo, whose genius was above all made of presentiments and foresight, shall it be said that Paris, France, Europe—Christendom from one end to the other—is nourished on illusions and flatters itself with optimistic dreams? Oh! yes, yes, what is stirring in the entire West and in the whole of America is really the spirit of Christ, you may be sure! Christendom does not realize itself unless it comprehends that it belongs to Christ. “*Mens agitat molem*.” Its Redeemer possessed it, and St. Paul would be socially right in our times: “*Non estis vestri, vos estis Christi*.” * O people, Christ holds you! Upon the Keep of Vincennes, the Pythoness spoke truly when, a hundred and ten years ago, she flung the blazing words to the world by the mouth of Diderot, prisoner of State: “*Deus, ecce Deus!*” “Arise, ye peoples, Deliverance is near!”

Do you see, Dear Madame, if one wishes to do justice to the system of our Redemption and the genius of its Founder, one must do two things: first, “not make a question of principles or doctrines into a question of persons or ecclesiastical establishments,” as one of your brilliant compatriots, Madame Svetchine, said; the Roman Church may no longer find itself at the height of the Holy Gospel, but the Gospel itself has lost nothing of its scientific, religious, and social value, for all that; it may be that the Christian priesthood has fallen, greatly fallen; but its decadence in no way involves that of Catholicism. It would be well to read Rosmini-Serbati in this connection! In the second place, we must bear in mind the deplorable state of the West when our Messiah came to open the Era of our Redemption, at once religious, social, economic, and political.

* [The text of the *Vulgate* for *I Cor.*, vi, 19 is as follows: “An nescitis quoniam membra vestra, templum sunt Spiritus sancti qui in vobis est, quem habetis a Dei, et non estis vestri?”—*Compiler*.]

But who can tell the frightful ravages working in the popular understanding and in the heart of the

Roman world, through the Satanic influence of the Caesarian idea which has ploughed it up for so many centuries? Who can narrate the vices inoculated into Europe by the abominable system of “might makes right” (tyrannizing and brutalizing the peoples, everywhere tied to the soil and riveted by the fetters of more than one kind of slavery), and which were at the heart of all the intellectual, moral and corporeal miseries everywhere, “*erantes et jacentes sicut oves non habentes pastorem*,” as Jesus Christ said.*

Although Cain, Irshu, Nimrod, those true fathers of Caesarism, were of Asiatic origin, it was not, however, upon the extreme East but upon the West that the calamities, let loose by those great villains, by those first schismatics from the divine and social Law which had governed all mankind until they arrived, precipitated themselves. The Oriental peoples saw that whirlwind of evils quickly decline toward the horizon and direct its course toward those distant shores which are enclosed by our mountains and seas.

Hence it was that some Fathers of the Church remark that Christ, dying on the cross at the extreme limit which separates the West from the East, held his face turned, his eyes open, and his arms extended toward the West. It is to be observed that the statutes of the Law of Ram were not broken then and are not entirely so even yet in Asia, while among us there remains no trace of them, since Julius Caesar stifled the last survivor of it in Druidic Gaul. If rightly understood, we should perhaps notice that the great law of the Abramid temples is exactly that of which the Redeemer spoke: “I am not come to destroy it but to raise it up, to fulfill it” throughout the whole world—*Non veni solvere, sed adimplere!* [Matt., v, 17].

Madame Blavatsky is too well initiated into the secrets of the primitive sanctuaries to be ignorant, that, long before Jesus Christ, the Hindû peoples had already passed through the social stages which our Messiah came to lead us through in our turn, in order to re-establish the equilibrium between these two great divisions of the human family, so long disrupted. She knows that, before this rupture, the entire world, as witnessed by Moses, had one sole and identical religious language, one sole and identical social constitution: “*Erat terra labii unius, et sermonum eorundem*” [Gen., xi, 1].

I am going to say something which not all of my brethren in the priesthood will understand, and that the more illiterate will probably condemn: “The East already had Messiahs and Christs, *humanly*

* [The text of the *Vulgate* for *I Peter*, ii, 25 is as follows: “*Eratio enim sicut oves errantes, sed conversi estis nunc ad pastorem, et episcopum animarum vestrarum.*”—*Compiler.*]

realized, when the West had only received, through the ministry of Moses and the Prophets, distant promises of its religious and social Redemption.”

It is said that “the Jews, thanks to the Legislator of Sinai, found themselves economically at the level of India, when our Messiah came.” That is possible, even probable; but what cannot be doubted is that the Western peoples, ruined by Roman Caesarism, were in a very backward state. Also, notice that while our social evolution, our religious Redemption, and our economic revival will continue, the Jews, the Hindûs, and the Chinese will remain stationary, or if they move at all it will not be forward. They will wait; they are still waiting. And what are they waiting for? I believe I do not deceive myself; they are waiting until we are in a condition to step out at the same pace as themselves; when the hour will strike to resume the march forward toward the Paradesa of Ram to which we shall return with them, hands clasped, with the same triumphant song.

And it is in this way that is explained in my mind the failure of the Christian preachings outside the particular sphere that the earliest priesthood of our Church had to evangelize: “preach first the Gospel to the scattered sheep of the house of Israel,” *or of Ram* (the family of Israel belongs to the Abramite stock and the

primitive spelling of Abraham is Abram, *i.e.*, Ab-Ram, issue of Ram). Madame Blavatsky enjoys holding Christ and our Church accountable for the impotence of our efforts in the East. She takes that set back as a defeat of Christianity, while, on the contrary, it is the confirmation of the Messianic plan when regarded in its true meaning. With statistics in hand, invoking and confirming the testimony of the venerable Bishop Temple, she observes that “since the beginning of our century, where the Christian missionaries have made but *three million* converts, the Mohammedans have acquired *two million* proselytes without the cost of one cent.” “A sign of the times!” she exclaims.

Oh, yes! a sign of the times, if one knows how to understand it, an evident sign that our religious economy is peculiar to the West and had but little to do in the East under the preliminary form of our Christian Churches. But wait! Lay aside the idea that it has provided a course of redemption for all the peoples who were ruined and martyred by the Caesarian brigandage. You will see later! You will see how it will spin, that top—our globe—in its entirety, under the whip of the glorious Christ.

I could add a large number of observations to the foregoing. I omit here four large pages in the draft that I am transcribing, but I am not closing yet. Let me run through a few points with meticulous care because the ground of argument is going to become a burning question.

So long as the work of the Redemption remains with us, the Holy Gospel of the Deliverance will not depart from our Latin, Greek,

Protestant, Anglican, Anglo-Saxon, and Anglo-American churches; but when, according to the promise of the Liberator, Christianity will have overthrown and annihilated Caesarism in all its political forms, great things will be seen!*

I have promised to let you hear the voice of Christ; this is your opportunity, so listen: “The principle of brutal and criminal force will be driven from the earth.” In other words, which are those of the Gospel: “*Princeps huius mundi ejicietur foras!*”† Satan-Caesar will flee from every quarter, his strongholds will be razed, his structures destroyed, his laws abolished. “I have conquered that abominable world: *ego vici mundum!*”‡ All economic, religious or social establishments not made by my heavenly Father, and whose foundations are not sunk in justice and divine verities, will be uprooted, utterly extirpated: *Omnis plantatio, quam non plantavit Pater meus coelestis, eradicabitur!*§ From that day, the judgment is given, and the crisis begins: “*Nunc iudicium est mundi, <Ø< 6D\F4| éFJÁ J@Ø 6`F9@L J@bJ@L.*”

Had I space enough at my disposal, I would not merely quote five or ten or a hundred texts. Evoking the Prophets, Christ, and his Apostles, and the Fathers of the primitive church and the entire Carmelite and Franciscan tradition, I would fill a book with their lightning and thunder. However, that would only be repeating what I have already published in *La Fin de l’Ancien Monde* (The End of the Ancient World) and one should not quote oneself.

If the priests knew how esoterically to read the dismal parables and funereal prophecies in our Gospel which relate to *the end of the world* and the *consummation of the cycle*; if they knew how to understand the symbolism of those *mountains that fall*, the *globe which trembles*, the sun which turns black as a coalsack, the *moon* which no longer reflects light, those *constellations* which are extinguished, those *stars* which fall, those *trumpets* which sound under the breath of Angels, those *foundations* which are split open, that *last judgment* which will separate the goats from the sheep . . . they would see that these prodigies are already

* [The Editor of *Le Lotus*, as is fully explained on the first page, is not responsible for the opinions of contributors. We would draw the attention of censors in countries where *Le Lotus* goes, that this is a controversial subject, but that we ourselves, do not take part in politics.—Editor, *Le Lotus*.]

† [These words as well as the last Latin words in this paragraph, to which the Greek version is appended, are from one and the same passage in the *Vulgate*, namely *John*, xii, 31: “Nunc iudicium est mundi: nunc princeps hujus mundi ejicietur foras.”—*Compiler*.]

‡ [*John*, xvi, 33.]

§ [*Matt.*, xv, 13.]

REPLY TO MADAME BLAVATSKY’S OBSERVATIONS

191

three-quarters realized, no doubt, in forms unexpected by the Vatican and in our sacristies, but none the less the exact fulfilment of the transcendental promises of our divine Liberator. They would also understand that the *world* and the *age* spoken of by Jesus Christ were not what our poor exegetes have imagined, but really the *world* and the *age* of the infamous Caesar and his abominable policy; a *world* and an *age* for which Jesus refused to pray—*non pro mundo rogo!* *—for the very simple reason that he came to destroy them; a *world* and an *age*, finally, which are none other than those of which John on the one hand, and Tacitus on the other, spoke frankly: *Totus mundus in maligno positus est—corrumpere et corrumpi saeculum est.* †

Permit me to inquire of Madame Blavatsky, in view of the general shake-up of social disintegration, of political decomposition and ecclesiastical divisions, to which old Europe as a whole is reduced in our time (and above all France, precisely because it is the eldest daughter and the Soldier of Christ), if she still thinks that my “hope is optimistic” and that Victor Hugo was under an illusion when he said, “in the Twentieth Century all that will be ended.” Does she believe that the destruction of the rotten structure could yet, for a long time, be conjured away by the desperate efforts of him she calls—she herself—the Mohammed of the West, the more because he has an understanding with “the man of iron” whom he has lately decorated with the title of the Chevalier of Christ, to the great amazement of all Catholics?

I repeat, I believe the hour is near, very near.

Caesar, that is the obstacle, that is the enemy! Once that monster is overthrown all will be changed. I do not wish to say that one bugle call will suffice to collect all peoples under the crook of the One Shepherd. But at least the way will be open, the West and the East will march together under the conduct of the same Christ-Spirit, and, *vive Dieu*, we shall indeed finish by re-entering the Paradise! The future is ours, thanks to the wise strategy of our Redeemer, and thanks to the sufferings of the Chrestos.

* [*John*, xvii, 9.]

† [The first part of this Latin quote is from the *Vulgate*, where in *I John*, v, 19 we find the passage: “Scimus, quoniam ex Deo sumus, et mundus totus in maligno positus est.”]

The second part is from Tacitus, *De origine et situ Germanorum liber*, xix, lines 8-9, which are as follows: “Nemo enim illic vitia ridet, nec corrumpere et corrumpi saeculum uocatur.” (See *The Germania of Tacitus*. A Critical Edition. Rodney Potter Robinson. Middletown, Conn.: Amer. Philol. Association, 1935.)—*Compiler*.]

Humanity has a fabulous destiny before it. We would not be understood, neither you, Madame, nor I, if we revealed that glorious future now.

Madame Blavatsky contradicts me far less than she thinks she does. I withdraw the words *Yliaster* and *Sat* which she does not allow, in order to propose that of *telesme* which was employed by Hermes-Trismegistus. Will she accept that? I doubt it. The fact is, there is no expression in our poor language to denote what I wish to say; but she certainly must have understood me, and that is enough.

Outside or beyond God, she accepts nothing, absolutely nothing, not even a mathematical point. She is right. However if one is not a *pantheist*—and Madame Blavatsky is no more than I am—one must express oneself in such a way that our readers will not take us for such. To be better understood, let us say, then, that God is immanent in the Cosmos, *present* through all and in all, but *distinct* from all. Are you satisfied, Madame? Yes, indeed? Well, so am I.

But, really, I do not understand how she can tease me about the *triple meaning* that we canonically recognize in our Holy Scriptures. The Gnosis, she says, in agreement with the Gupta-Vidyâ, provides *seven* keys, and not merely *three*, to open the seven mysteries. Is Madame Blavatsky ignorant of the fact that the Christian Doctrine is essentially *ternary* in all points in which the Buddhist teaching is septenary? This is not to say that we do not appreciate the real basis of the Oriental system any more than you could misunderstand the real foundation of the Western system. We have simplified and summed up your theory without distorting it. Our three keys are equivalent to your seven and include them, as your seven are equivalent to our three which they subdivide.

Everyone knows that the white ray is decomposed into three principal colours which, themselves composite, produce, by a new decomposition, the seven colours of the rainbow. Similarly, analyzing the human being, St. Paul, the true father of our sacred science, describes in him three chief elements which he calls *spirit*, *soul*, and *body*: “*integer spiritus et anima et corpus*”; the Buddhists, being able to analyze man still further, discovered *seven principles* in him. There is no contradiction in that; you are right and we also: your seven are our three and our three are your seven. Such is our dogma, appropriate to our intellect and our mental categories, less subtle and less penetrating than yours, but also simpler because more rudimentary. We confess and adore in God a *unique* essence, proceeding in *three* distinct persons, in *three* diverse principles of action, and energizing the creature by *seven* operations which we call the *seven* manifestations or the *seven* gifts of the Paraclete. There is in all this something which recalls the *seven* distinct states of your *prajñâ*, which answer in their turn to the *seven* modifications of matter, and to the *seven* forms or *seven* classes of the phenomena of force.

REPLY TO MADAME BLAVATSKY’S OBSERVATIONS

193

I like to believe, Madame, that the better we understand one another, the better we shall appreciate one another, and, who knows, God willing, maybe do some good to the poor of the West—and to the poor of the East also, for, as you know even better than I do, the poor are not lacking there, even in places not far from the Mahatmas.

ABBÉ ROCA, *Honorary Canon.*

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

194

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

RÉPONSE AUX FAUSSES CONCEPTIONS DE M. L'ABBÉ ROCA RELATIVES À MES OBSERVATIONS SUR L'ÉSOTÉRISME CHRÉTIEN

[*Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. II, No. 13, avril 1888, pp. 3-19]

Monsieur l'abbé parle, dans *Le Lotus* du mois de février d'une «bourrade» qu'il aurait reçue de moi.* En même temps, avec une mansuétude, je ne dirai pas chrétienne,—car les chrétiens ne sont ni humbles ni doux dans leurs polémiques—mais toute bouddhiste, mon interlocuteur me fait savoir qu'il ne m'en veut nullement. Au contraire, dit-il, il me sait gré «de la rondeur de mes manières et de la haute franchise de mon verbe», effets tout naturels de ma «désinvolture d'amazone».

Un esprit plus chicanier que le mien pourrait trouver là quelque chose à dire. Il ferait remarquer, par exemple, que cette surabondance d'adjectifs et d'épithètes personnelles, dans une réponse à des observations sur un sujet aussi abstrait que la métaphysique religieuse, dénote tout le contraire de la satisfaction. Mais les théosophes sont peu gâtés par leurs critiques et, moi la première, j'ai souvent reçu des compliments plus mal tournés que ceux que me prodigue M. l'abbé Roca. J'aurais donc tort de ne pas apprécier sa courtoisie, d'autant plus que, dans sa touchante sollicitude à s'occuper de ma personne, à rendre justice à ma «virile intelligence» et à ma «mâle vigueur», Monsieur l'abbé a relégué le Christ théologique au second plan et ne souffle mot du Christ *ésotérique*.

Or, comme je n'ai rien à faire du premier, et que je nie *in toto* le Christ inventé par l'Église, en même temps que toutes les doctrines, toutes les interprétations et tous les

* Voir «Notes sur 'l'Esotérisme du Dogme Chrétien' de M. l'abbé Roca» dans le numéro de décembre 1887 du *Lotus*, page 160 (N. de la D.).

dogmes, anciens et modernes, concernant ce personnage, je commence par déclarer que la Réponse de M. l'abbé à mes «Notes sur l'Ésotérisme du Dogme Chrétien» n'est pas une réponse du tout. Je ne trouve pas, dans toute sa volumineuse lettre, une seule phrase qui

contredise sérieusement mes objections, en les réfutant logiquement et scientifiquement. La foi—et surtout la foi aveugle —ne saurait être «critiquement discutée»; en tous cas, elle ne peut jamais être «scientifiquement établie», quand bien même le lecteur chrétien se contenterait d'une semblable casuistique. Mon interlocuteur m'en veut même pour avoir «déployé» ce qu'il lui plaît d'appeler «tant d'érudition». Cela se conçoit. Contre des arguments historiques et valides il ne peut m'objecter comme preuves «expérimentales» qu'un seul fait: Jésus-Christ *dans son âme*, lui disant tous les jours «qu'il est le Maître *Unique* et le *seul* vrai docteur». Faible preuve, celle-là, devant la science, la loi et même le sens commun d'un incroyant!

Il est certain que le fameux paradoxe de Tertullien: «*Credo quia absurdum et impossibile est*»,* n'a rien à voir dans une discussion de ce genre. Je croyais m'adresser au mystique érudit, à M. l'abbé Roca socialiste et libéral, et je ne me serais dérangée que pour un *curé*, un *fidei defensor*! M. l'abbé Roca s'en tire en disant: «Je connais assez le Bouddhisme pour la [moi] comprendre sur-lechamp; elle ne connaît pas assez le Christianisme pour me saisir du premier coup». Désolée de le contredire! mais la vérité avant tout. Monsieur l'abbé s'illusionne en croyant connaître le bouddhisme: il est aisé de voir qu'il ne le connaît pas même *exotériquement*, non plus que l'hindouisme, même populaire. Autrement, est-ce qu'il aurait jamais placé Krishna, comme il le fait page 259, au nombre des Bouddhas; ou encore, aurait-il confondu le nom d'un personnage historique, le prince Gautama,

* [This is the often misquoted sentence from Tertullian's *Carne Christi*, chap. v, which runs: «*Certum est quia impossibile est*», it is certain because it is impossible.—*Compiler*.]

avec ses titres mystiques, les énumérant comme autant de Bouddhas!

N'écrit-il pas, en effet, en parlant de Jésus, que le calice qu'il but était «autrement amer que la coupe où Socrate but la ciguë en Occident, *et que celle où Krishna, Çakyamouni,* Gautama de Kapilavastou, Siddharta et tous les autres Bouddhas se sont abreuvés. . . .*» (?) Ce «et les autres Bouddhas» est une preuve définitive, pour nous, que non seulement Monsieur l'abbé ne sait rien du Bouddhisme ésotérique, mais encore qu'il n'a aucune idée de la simple biographie historique et populaire du grand Réformateur hindou. C'est absolument comme si, en parlant de Jésus, j'écrivais: «Orphée, le fils de Marie, Emmanuel, le Sauveur, le Nazaréen et tous les autres Christs qui ont été crucifiés». Sans perdre son temps à signaler un tas de *lapsus linguae* se rapportant aux termes sanscrits, brahmaniques et bouddhiques semés dans les articles de M. l'abbé Roca,—articles fort érudits du reste et certainement éloquents comme style,—il suffit de cet exemple pour laisser le public juger si mon critique connaît le premier mot du Bouddhisme dans la polémique actuelle. M. l'abbé le confondrait-il encore, comme tant d'autres, avec la Théosophie? Dans ce cas, je me permettrais de lui apprendre que la Théosophie n'est ni

Bouddhisme, ni Christianisme, ni Judaïsme, ni Mahométisme, ni Hindouisme, ni aucun autre mot en *isme*; c'est la *synthèse ésotérique* de toutes les religions et de toutes les philosophies connues.

Je dois donc savoir quelque chose du Christianisme— populaire et surtout *exotérique*,—pour me permettre d'entrer en lice avec un abbé catholique aussi érudit que l'est mon adversaire. Ne dirait-on pas plutôt (en admettant pour le moment que je n'ai pu «saisir du premier coup» *le Christianisme de M. l'abbé Roca*) que mon honoré interlocuteur ne sait pas trop ce qu'il prêche? qu'ayant jeté

* Ce titre, grâce à l'amabilité de M. Gaboriau, n'a point paru avec les autres dans *Le Lotus*, mais j'ai les premières épreuves où il se trouve dans l'ordre indiqué ci-dessus.

RÉPONSE AUX FAUSSES CONCEPTIONS

197

par-dessus les moulins son bonnet d'ecclésiastique *orthodoxe et papiste*, et négligeant le véritable ésotérisme des brahmes *et* des bouddhistes, des gnostiques payens et chrétiens comme de l'authentique cabbale chaldéenne, et ne sachant rien des doctrines des théosophes, qu'il s'est fabriqué un Christianisme à lui, un Ésotérisme *sui generis*? J'avoue que je ne le comprends pas.

Quand à sa «*Loi de Ram*» et son «*Ab-Ram, issu de Ram*» (?)—connais pas. Je connais parfaitement la VANĀVALI OU généalogie des races de Sourya et de Chandra * depuis Ikshvaku et Boudha † jusqu'à Rama et Krishna: source commune où les *Pouranas* (anciennes Ecritures), le *Bhagavata*, le *Skanda*, l'*Agni* et le *Bhavishya Pourana*, ont puisé leurs généalogies divines, humaines et dynastiques. La copie s'en trouve dans la Bibliothèque royale des *Maharadjas* d'Oudeïpour (la plus ancienne des maisons royales des Indes, et dont la généalogie familiale a été revue et sanctionnée par le gouvernement angloindien). Rama est un personnage *historique*. Les ruines des cités bâties par lui, et ensevelies sous plusieurs étages successifs d'autres cités moins anciennes mais toujours *préhistoriques*, existent encore aux Indes; on les connaît ainsi que de vieilles monnaies avec son effigie et son nom. Qu'est-ce donc que cet «*Ab-Ram, issu de Ram*»? ‡ *A-bram*

* Sourya et Chandra (Solaire et Lunaire), appellations respectives des deux grandes races primitives et radicales de l'Aryavarta, dites races Solaire et Lunaire.

† J'espère que le lecteur se gardera de confondre Boudha (avec un seul *d*), le fils de *Soma*, la Lune, avec le titre mystique de Bouddha (deux *d*). L'un est le nom propre d'un individu (Boudha, l'Intelligence ou Sagesse), l'autre le titre des Sages, des «*Illuminés*».

‡ Ce ne sont pas les tribus des fiers Rajpoutes de la race Solaire, *Souryavansa*—tribus *prouvent historiquement* leur descendance de Lava et de Kousha, les deux fils de Rama—qui reconnaîtraient cet «*Ab-ram*» inconnu. Voir dans un prochain No. du *Lotus*, ma note No. I sur Abraham.

[In the course of this essay, H. P. B. refers eight different times to certain Notes, numbered from 1 to 8, which she seems to have written for some forthcoming issue of *Le Lotus*. Such Notes have not been found in any later issue of this journal, and are certainly not the

ou *A-brahm*, en sanscrit, veut dire un non-brahme, ou bien un homme chassé de la caste des brahmes, ou un homme d'une caste inférieure. *Abra* est le nom de l'éléphant d'Indra; sa femelle se nomme *Abramu*. Les mots sont sanscrits et le nom *Abramu* se retrouve en Chaldée, mais l'Abraham des Juifs n'a rien à faire avec le Rama indou;* il ne peut en être issu, puisque c'est, au contraire, Rama qui est issu de Brahm(neutre) en passant par son aspect terrestre, Vishnou, dont il est l'Avatar.†

Ceci est une simple digression que M. l'abbé va peut-être encore appeler *une bourrade*. Je dirai à ce propos qu'il a la peau bien sensible, car je ne vois pas, dans mes Notes sur l'ésotérisme chrétien, ce qui a pu faire évoluer semblables idée dans l'imagination de mon honorable interlocuteur. Le souffle qui renverse un château de cartes peut bien passer pour une forte bourrasque aux yeux de l'architecte qui l'a bâti; mais si M. l'abbé Roca s'en prend au souffle plutôt qu'à la faiblesse de son édifice, ce n'est toujours pas ma faute. Il m'accuse aussi d'*esprit de parti*; c'est une accusation aussi injuste que l'autre. Comme je ne suis ni abbé ni sous la férule féroce d'une Église qui se déclare infaillible, *je suis prête, moi, à accepter la vérité d'ou qu'elle vienne*. Moins heureux que moi, mon critique, se trouvant entre l'enclume et le marteau, ne peut accepter mes conclusions et cherche, dès lors, à les rejeter sur mon «esprit de parti» et mon «ignorance» de sa religion. Encore une fois, il ne saurait y avoir d'esprit de parti dans une Société universelle et impartiale comme est la nôtre, ayant choisi pour devise: «Il n'y a pas de religion

footnotes which she appended, in the June, 1888, issue of *Le Lotus*, to the final installment of this controversy with the Abbé Roca. So it is impossible to say at the present time what particular Notes were meant.—*Compiler.*]

* *Ab, Aba* veut dire «père» mais seulement dans les langues sémitiques.

† Nous ferons remarquer au lecteur, en passant, l'importance de ces remarques, car les livres de Fabre d'Olivet et de M. Saint-Yves reposent sur des données complètement en désaccord avec elles (N. de la D.).

plus élevée que la Vérité», et nos Maîtres étant de trop grands Sages pour se parer des plumes de paon de l'infailibilité et même pour se targuer de la possession de la Vérité absolue, leurs disciples ont toujours l'esprit ouvert aux faits qu'on voudra bien leur démontrer. Que M. l'abbé démolisse les preuves que nous offrons contre l'existence d'un Christ charnel, d'où *Christ-homme*, s'appelât-il Jésus ou Krishna; qu'il nous démontre qu'il n'y eut jamais d'autre Dieu incarné que son «Jésus-Christ», et que celui-ci est le «seul» comme «le plus grand» des Maîtres et des Docteurs—pas seulement le plus grand des Mahatmas mais *Dieu en personne!* Fort bien; alors, qu'il nous en donne des preuves

irréfutables ou, au moins, aussi logiques et évidentes que celles avancées par nous. Mais qu'il ne vienne pas nous offrir comme preuves la voix qui parle dans son âme ou des citations tirées de l'Évangile. Car, sa voix—serait-elle sœurjumelle de celle du *daïmon* de Socrate—n'a pas plus de valeur, dans l'argumentation, pour nous et pour le public, que n'en a pour lui ou toute autre personne la voix qui me dit le contraire dans *mon* âme. Oui, il a raison de dire qu'«il est si malaisé de se déprendre de tout intérêt personnel, et plus encore, de tout esprit de parti, d'école, de secte, d'Église, de caste»; comme cette phrase ne saurait en rien s'appliquer à moi qui ne tiens à aucune école spéciale, qui n'appartiens à aucune secte, Église ou caste, puisque je suis *théosophe*, ne s'appliquerait-elle pas à lui, Chrétien, Catholique, Ecclésiastique et Chanoine?

En outre, notre estimable correspondant doit avoir l'imagination assez vive. Ne voilà-t-il pas qu'il aperçoit la Direction du *Lotus* «enivré par le fumet capiteux» de ses éloges envers le savoir des Mahatmas et lui «faisant signe de l'œil et de la tête». En ce cas, la Direction doit avoir le vin triste, puisqu'au lieu de le remercier de ses avances si flatteuses (flatteuses d'après lui), elle m'a envoyé son premier article à Londres pour que j'y répondisse, et qu'elle l'a fait suivre de ma «bourrade». Nos faits et gestes ne cadrent donc pas avec l'idée que s'en fait M. l'abbé Roca. Il est vrai qu'il a prévenu les lecteurs que «personne ne suspectera cette dame [son humble servante] de

courtisanerie à l'égard des prêtres catholiques». Ceci est un fait incontestable et *historique*; c'est même le seul que je trouve dans sa longue Épître. Si, ayant l'expérience de tout une longue vie passée à connaître les susdits prêtres, j'ai posé l'éteignoir sur l'espoir couleur de rose dont brillait la flamme de sa première lettre, c'est que je ne saurais prendre au sérieux de simples compliments de politesse d'un abbé chrétien et français à l'adresse des Mahatmas *payens*, et que, si la Direction du *Lotus* français a pu se tromper, la directrice du *Lucifer* anglais y a vu clair.* Tout en appréciant sincèrement M. l'abbé Roca comme homme écrivain, tout en séparant dans ma pensée le philosophe mystique du prêtre, je ne pouvais cependant pas perdre de vue sa soutane. Donc, l'hommage rendu par lui au savoir de nos maîtres, au lieu de *m'enivrer de son fumet*, m'était apparu dès le premier instant sous son vrai symbolisme. Cet «hommage» y jouait le rôle d'un mât de cocagne, érigé pour servir de support aux brimborions chrétiens qu'une main apostolique et romaine y attachait à profusion, ou de poupée indo-théosophique qu'elle affublait d'amulettes papistes.† Et, loin d'être *enivrée*—je le confesse avec ma «franchise» et ma rudesse ordinaires *comme sans ambages*—je ne sentis qu'un redoublement de méfiance.

Les fausses conceptions dont la Réponse de M. l'abbé fourmille prouvent combien j'avais raison. S'attendait-il donc à ce que la Direction du *Lotus* et les théosophes

* Nous n'osons saisir la pensée de Mme Blavatsky, mais nous croyons que dans le cas présent nous ne nous sommes pas trompés. Nous avons offert généreusement une tribune à M. l'abbé Roca; il y a exposé ses idées que M^{me} Blavatsky réfute d'ailleurs de main de maître; d'autres y exposent et y exposeront les leurs,

car *Le Lotus* a pour but d'instruire ses lecteurs tout en donnant la parole de temps à autre à des esprits éminents qui peuvent différer, sur quelques points, d'opinion avec nous (N. de la D.).

† M^{me} Blavatsky juge d'après l'esprit et les termes de l'article en question. Nous savons que M. l'abbé Roca tonne avec éloquence contre Léon XIII, mais celui-ci étant atteint d'une surdité incurable ne peut l'entendre, d'ailleurs, on ne saurait réveiller les morts et il vaut mieux les laisser pour s'occuper de *ce qui est vivant* (N. de la D.).

s'écriassent en chœur: *Mea culpa!* et se convertissent en masse à ses idées? Nous le voyons, à la première réplique de ceux-ci, parer des coups imaginaires et donner, dans une seconde lettre, une tout autre couleur aux compliments de son premier article. Il a le droit certainement; mieux que personne, il doit connaître le fond de sa pensée. Mais il en est ainsi pour tout le monde, je pense. Pourquoi alors va-t-il *dénaturer* ce que je dis, et même inventer des cas et des scènes *impossibles* où il me fait jouer un rôle étrange et m'attribue des paroles qu'il n'a certes pas trouvées dans mes «Notes» en réponse à son article du mois de décembre? L'idée fondamentale de mes observations était, en effet, que celui qui voudra dire «*Ego sum veritas*» est encore à naître; que le «*Vos Dii estis*» s'applique à tous, et que tout homme né d'une femme est «le fils de Dieu»—qu'il soit bon, mauvais ou ni l'un ni l'autre. Ou M. l'abbé Roca s'obstine à ne pas me comprendre, ou il poursuit un but. Je ne m'oppose pas du tout à ce qu'il prenne la voix foudroyante de son Église latine pour celle qu'il croit entendre dans *le fond de son âme*, mais je m'oppose formellement à ce qu'il me représente comme partageant les dogmes qui lui sont ainsi inculqués, lorsque je les répudie complètement.

Jugez un peu. J'écris en toutes lettres qu'un Christ (ou *Christos*) divin n'a jamais existé *sous une forme humaine* ailleurs que dans l'imagination des blasphémateurs qui ont carnalisé *un principe universel et tout impersonnel*. J'ose croire que c'est fort clair. Eh bien, l'abbé Roca, après m'avoir représentée disant: la vérité, c'est moi—absurdité que je laisse aux Églises qui l'ont trouvée et dont un Adepté, un Sage rirait de pitié—se laisse aller à l'assertion suivante:

«Il se rencontre qu'avant M^{me} Blavatsky quelqu'un s'est présenté au monde qui a dit carrément: 'La VÉRITÉ, c'est moi,—*Ego sum Veritas!*' Ce langage est du Christ, et s'il ne révélait pas Dieu lui-même il trahirait le plus effronté des imposteurs. Or, dire que le Christ est un imposteur, *on s'en gardera bien devant M^{me} Blavatsky qui répliquerait par une maîtresse gifle sur la bouche du blasphémateur. Donc . . . concluez vous-mêmes*».

Ce que les autres conclueront ou ne conclueront pas m'intéresse fort peu. Mais je conclurai moi-même, car Je crois comprendre.

De deux choses l'une:

a. Ou Monsieur l'abbé n'a pas la moindre idée nette quant à la théosophie, quant à ses propres doctrines, quant à moi, l'humble disciple de la Vérité, et parle au vent et à l'aventure;

b. Ou il a voulu me mettre au pied du mur, me forcer à m'expliquer pour avoir de moi une réponse catégorique. La raison ne serait pas mauvais. Ou bien M^{me} Blavatsky passera sous silence cette assertion aussi extraordinaire que fautive et alors—qui ne dit mot consent, ou bien elle y répondra pour la contredire et la nier; et dans ce dernier cas elle se fera de nouveaux ennemis parmi les chrétiens, et c'est autant de gagné.

Est-ce cela, Monsieur l'abbé? Alors, c'est un faux calcul de plus. L'«amazone» aura cette fois, comme les autres du reste, assez de «mâle vigueur» pour répondre sans ambages et à la face de l'univers ce qu'elle pense de votre petit arrangement. En effet, dire que le Christ (nous disons *Christos*) est *imposteur*, ce serait proférer non pas un *blasphème* mais une simple stupidité: un adjectif personnel ne peut s'appliquer à un principe idéal, à une abstraction; ce serait comme si l'on disait: «l'espace infini est un dévot». Un théosophe occultiste rirait. Quant à la supposition que je suis capable de répliquer «par une maîtresse gifle» sur la bouche de celui qui proférerait la phrase, elle est encore plus baroque. Monsieur l'abbé oublie que je suis théosophe d'abord, et ignore probablement que je suis personnellement disciple de la philosophie bouddhiste. Or un vrai bouddhiste ne donnerait pas même une tape à un chien pour l'empêcher d'aboyer. Les bouddhistes *pratiquent* toutes les vertus prêchées dans le «Sermon sur la Montagne» de Gayâ—sur la montagne de Galilée six siècles plus tard—vertus dont on n'entend guère parler dans les églises des pays chrétiens et qu'on y met encore moins en pratique. Les bouddhistes ne résistent pas, ils ne rendent pas le mal pour le mal: ils laissent la gloire de

gifler, de couper les oreilles à leurs adversaires, aux saints Pierre qui défendent ainsi leur Maître pour le trahir et le renier deux heures après, selon le triste récit.

Monsieur l'abbé désire-t-il savoir, *sans ambages*, ce que je pense de la légende chrétienne? Il m'est facile de le satisfaire.

Pour moi, Jésus-Christ, c'est-à-dire l'Homme-Dieu des chrétiens, copie des Avatars de tous les pays, du Krishna indou comme de l'Horus égyptien, n'a jamais été un personnage *historique*. C'est une personnification déifiée du type glorifié des grands Hiérophantes des Temples,* et son histoire racontée dans le Nouveau Testament est une allégorie, contenant certainement de profondes vérités ésotériques, mais c'est une allégorie. Elle s'interprète à l'aide des *sept clefs* de même que le *Pentateuque*. Cette théorie des sept clefs, l'Église, d'après l'abbé Roca, l'aurait simplifiée et résumée en trois «sans la dénaturer», alors qu'au contraire elle a fabriqué trois fausses clefs qui n'ouvrent rien du tout. La légende dont je parle est

* Chaque acte du Jésus du Nouveau Testament, chaque parole qu'on lui attribue, chaque évènement qu'on lui rapporte pendant les trois années de la mission qu'on lui fait accomplir, repose sur le programme du Cycle de l'Initiation, cycle basé lui-même sur la précession des Équinoxes et les signes du Zodiaque. Lorsque l'Évangile hébreu non *selon* mais *par* Mathieu le Gnostique dont on a fait un Évangéliste—évangile dont parle (saint) Jérôme au IV^e siècle et qu'il a refusé de traduire sous prétexte qu'il était falsifié (!) par Séleucus, disciple manichéen (*Vide* Hiéronymus, *De viris illust.*, cap. 3)—lorsque, disje, ce document *original* aura été traduit, si jamais on le retrouve, et que les Eglises chrétiennes auront du moins *UR* document non falsifié, alors on pourra parler de la «vie de Jésus» dont «nul n'ignore» les évènements. En attendant, et sans perdre son temps à se disputer au sujet du siècle ou aurait vécu Je'sus ou Jehoshua, un fait est certain, c'est que les Occultistes sont en mesure de prouver que même les paroles sacramentelles qu'on lui attribue sur la croix ont été *dératurées* et qu'elles veulent dire tout autre chose que leur traduction grecque. (Voir mes notes additionnelles—No. 2—dans un prochain numéro du *Lotus*.)

[*Vide* the English translation of this footnote for the Compiler's explanatory note concerning H. P. B.'s reference to the writings of Hieronymus.—*Compiler*.]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

204

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

fondée, ainsi que je l'ai démontré à diverses reprises dans mes écrits et dans mes notes, sur l'existence d'un personnage nommé Jehoshua (dont on a fait Jésus), né à Lüid ou Lydda vers l'an 120 avant l'ère moderne. Et si l'on contredit ce fait—ce à quoi je ne m'oppose guère—il faudra en prendre son parti et regarder le héros du drame du Calvaire comme un mythe pur et simple. En effet, malgré toutes les recherches désespérées faites pendant de longs siècles, si on laisse de côté le témoignage des «Evangélistes», c'est-à-dire d'hommes inconnus dont l'identité ne fut jamais établie, et celle des *Pères* de l'Église, fanatiques intéressés, ni l'histoire, ni la tradition profane, ni les documents officiels, ni les contemporains du soi-disant drame, n'ont pu fournir une seule preuve sérieuse de l'existence réelle et historique, non seulement de l'Homme-Dieu mais même du nommé Jésus de Nazareth, depuis l'an 1 jusqu'à l'année 33. Tout est ténèbre et silence. Philon de Judée, né avant l'ère chrétienne et mort longtemps après l'année où, d'après Renan, l'hallucination d'une hystérique, Marie de Magdala, donne un Dieu au monde, Philon fit dans cet intervalle de quarante et quelques années plusieurs voyages à Jérusalem. n y alla pour écrire l'histoire des sectes religieuses de la Palestine à son époque. Il n'est pas d'écrivain plus correct dans ses récits, plus soucieux de ne rien omettre: aucune communauté, aucune fraternité, fût-elle la plus insignifiante, ne lui échappe. Pourquoi donc ne parle-t-il pas des Nazaréens? Pourquoi ne fait-il pas la plus lointaine allusion aux Apôtres, au Galiléen *divin*, à la Crucification? La réponse est facile. Parce que la biographie de Jésus fut *inventée après le premier siècle* et que personne, à Jérusalem n'était plus renseigné que Philon sur ce sujet. On n'a qu'à lire la querelle d'Irénée avec les gnostiques, au IIe siècle, pour s'en assurer. Ptolémée (l'an 180) ayant fait remarquer que Jésus ne prêcha qu'*un an* au dire de la légende, et qu'il était trop jeune pour avoir pu enseigner quelque chose d'important, Irénée a un bel accès d'indignation et certifie que Jésus prêcha plus de dix et *même de vingt ans!* La tradition seule, dit-il, parle de *dix ans* (lib. II, c.22, pp.4, 5). Ailleurs, il fait mourir Jésus *âgé de plus de*

RÉPONSE AUX FAUSSES CONCEPTIONS

205

cinquante ans!! Or, si déjà en l'année 180 un père de l'Église a recours à la tradition et que personne n'était sûr de rien et qu'on ne faisait pas grand cas des Évangiles —des *Logia*

dont il y avait plus de soixante,—qu’a à faire l’histoire dans tout ceci? Confusion, mensonges, fourberies et faux, voilà le bilan des premiers siècles. Eusèbe de Césarée, le roi des falsificateurs, insère les fameuses 16 lignes touchant Jésus, dans un manuscrit de Josèphe, pour donner le change aux gnostiques qui niaient qu’il y eût jamais eu un personnage *réel* du nom de Jésus.* Plus encore: il attribue à Josèphe, un fanatique mort comme il avait vécu, en Juif obstiné, la réflexion qu’il n’est peut-être pas juste de l’appe]er (lui, Iasous) un homme ("*<ZD*), car il était l’*Oint* du Seigneur, c’est-à-dire le Messie!! (Voyez Josèphe, *Antiq.*, lib. XVIII, cap. iii, 3.)

Mais à quoi bon perdre son temps à redire des choses que tout homme bien élevé connaît. Monsieur l’abbé nous renvoie, à tout moment, aux Évangiles et à saint Paul, et, faisant pleuvoir un torrent de citations, il demande triomphalement: «Est-ce assez clair? Le Christ ne dit-il pas *lui-même* ceci et cela, et saint Paul ne nous assure-t-il pas que. . . , etc., etc». Inutile de dire que pour que les paroles de Jésus obtiennent quelque valeur comme preuve, il faut d’abord que l’authenticité des Évangiles soit prouvée. Jésus, qu’il ait vécu à cette époque ou auparavant, *n’a rien écrit*, et ce qu’on lui fait dire dans les quatre Évangiles est parfois terriblement contradictoire. Quant à Paul, personnage historique certainement, il serait difficile de se retrouver au milieu de ce qu’il dit lui-même et de ce que ses éditeurs et correcteurs lui font dire. Il est resté cependant—par inadvertance sans doute—une phrase, de lui ou de ses collaborateurs, qui résume en deux mots ce qu’on pensait de Jésus. Voyez *Épître aux Hébreux*, ii, 9;

* Ajoutez à cela qu’il invente le fameux monogramme pour le *Labarum* de Constantin (combinaison de X, Chi, P, Rho, initiales de *Christos* qu’il applique à Jésus) et fabrique la vision de cet empereur. Mais Gibbon et d’autres historiens ont depuis longtemps jugé Eusèbe dont on connaît la valeur maintenant.—Voir dans un prochain numéro du *Lotus* mes notes (No. 3) à ce sujet.

vous y lirez que Jésus a été fait «*inférieur aux anges*». Cela nous suffit. Celui qui est *inférieur* aux anges peut-il être Dieu, l’Infini et l’Unique?

Oui tout homme, tout *Ju-su* (nom d’Horus, Khons, le Fils, type de l’homme), tout initié surtout dont le corps est fait inférieur à celui des anges, peut, en présence de son *Atman* (Esprit divin), dire: *Vivit vero in me Christus*, comme il dirait: Krishna, Bouddha or Ormuzd vit en moi.* Après avoir répété ce que j’avais dit dans mes «Notes» du *Christos* ne se développant que par le *Chrestos*, comme s’il disait quelque chose de neuf et *venant de lui*, Monsieur l’abbé s’écrie d’un ton menaçant que nul n’entrera dans ce corps glorifié sinon par la «voie critique et la porte étroite». Pour lui, c’est le *Nirvana* béatique, et il continue à prêcher ce que nous prêchons depuis douze ans et ce que je disais encore dans mes Notes. Il me permettra d’achever ce qu’il laisse en si beau chemin, ne trouvant cette voie que dans le giron de son Église, de sa foi à lui. Malheureusement son *angusta porta*, et *arcta via* ne peuvent s’appliquer ni à son Église ni à sa foi. Dans cette Église où tout

s'achète, crimes et indulgences, amulettes et béatitude (sur terre, du moins; quant au Ciel—après moi le Déluge!), la *voie* et la *porte* s'élargissent en proportion des sommes payées par le croyant. Arrière religion de Judas! C'est à (saint) Pierre que son maître a dit: VADE RETRO SATANAS! La preuve en est dans l'Évangile même, disje, répétant la phrase coutumière de M. l'abbé Roca.

* En hébreu, l'homme, ou *Aïsh* (:*!) donne par dérivation cabbalistique cette autre forme :*, Jesh, en grec et en français *Jes-us*, signifiant en même temps *le feu*, le *soleil*, la *divinité* et l'*homme*. Ce mot (voyez-le avec les points de la massore) était prononcé :!, *ish* ou *Jesh*, l'*homme* dans ce cas. La forme féminine était %:!, *Issa*, la *femme*; en égyptien *Isi-s*, *Isis*. La forme collatérale en était *:* *Jesse*, ou *Isi*, dont le féminin en égyptien était *Isi-s*. Mais *Isi* est l'équivalente de *Jesse*, le père de David, de la race de qui vient Jésus, *Jes-us*. C'est qu'il faut connaître la langue du Mystère et du Symbolisme avant de parler avec tant d'autorité, et cette langue l'Église l'a perdue.—Voir mes notes (No. 4) dans un prochain numéro du *Lotus*.

Il m'envoie à Damas pour que je devienne «une initiée parfaite et la plus grande des Chrétiennes Bouddhistes» (?). Que dirait-il si je lui répondais que c'est après de longues années passées dans la condition de *Chrêstos*, après trente ans de martyre moral et physique, que j'y suis allée, et que c'est précisément sur ce chemin glorieux que j'ai découvert que les Églises qui s'intitulent *chrétiennes* ne sont que des sépulcres blanchis pleins des ossements du paganisme ésotérique et de pourriture morale? Aussi, aimerais-je mieux rester la plus humble des bouddhistes ésotériques que la plus grande des chrétiennes exotériques et orthodoxes. J'ai le plus profond respect pour l'idée transcendente du *Christos* (ou Christ) universel qui vit dans l'âme du Boschiman et du Zoulou sauvages comme dans celle de M. l'abbé Roca, mais j'ai l'aversion la plus vive pour la *christolâtrie* des Églises. Je haie ces dogmes et ces doctrines qui ont dégradé le Christos idéal, en faisant un fétiche anthropomorphe absurde et grotesque, une idole jalouse et cruelle qui damne pour l'éternité ceux qui ne veulent pas se courber devant elle.* Le plus petit des

* Prouver le bien-fondé de ma répugnance m'est d'autant plus facile que je n'ai, pour appuyer mon dire, qu'à ouvrir *The Tablet*, le principal organe des *catholiques romains* d'Angleterre. Voici ce que j'y découpe:

«La publication récente du rapport officiel sur le progrès matériel et moral de l'Inde nous fournit une intéressante contribution à la controverse engagée sur la question des missionnaires. *Il ressort de ces chiffres* que, tandis que *nous produisons une détérioration morale très marquée* sur les natifs, en les convertissant à notre crédo, le niveau naturel de leur moralité est si élevé que, malgré notre christianisation, nous ne pouvons arriver à les rendre aussi pervers que nous. Les chiffres représentant les proportions de la criminalité dans les diverses classes sont ainsi qu'il suit:—Européens, 1 pour 274; Eurasiens, 1 pour 509; Chrétiens natifs, 1 pour 799; Mahométans, 1 pour 856; *Indous*, 1 pour 1361, et *Bouddhistes*, 1 pour 3787. Ce dernier chiffre est un magnifique hommage rendu à la noble pureté du Bouddhisme, mais les statistiques sont encore instructives en montrant, d'une manière irrésistible qu'en fait de politique sociale nous ferions mieux de consacrer le superflu de notre argent et de notre zèle, pendant une génération ou deux, à l'amélioration morale de nos

propres compatriotes, au lieu d'essayer de détruire la moralité et la théologie de peuples qui pourraient raisonnablement nous envoyer des missions pour nous convertir». Quel superbe aveu!

gnostiques docètes soutenant que Jésus crucifié n'était qu'une *illusion*, et son histoire une allégorie, était bien plus près de la vérité qu'un «saint» Augustin ou même un «Ange des écoles». Un païen vivant une vie simple et patriarcale, aimant son prochain et faisant son devoir, est mille fois plus près de l'*angusta porta, et arcta via* que ne le fut jamais un (saint) Cyrille, féroce meurtrier d'Hypathie, ou un (saint) Constantin, béatifié probablement parce qu'il tua son fils de ses propres mains, fit bouillir des moines dans de la poix, éventra sa femme et s'illustra aussi tristement que Néron.*

Ah! nous dit M. l'abbé, «si la sublime conception de cet idéal [le *Christos* vivant dans l'homme] chrétien est celle des Mahatmas, honneur à eux» ! Cet idéal n'est pas chrétien, et ce ne sont pas les Mahatmas non plus qui l'ont inventé: *c'était l'Apothéose des Mystères de l'Initiation*. Quant au «Verbe fait chair», c'est l'héritage de l'humanité entière, reçu par l'homme le jour où l'Ame universelle s'incarna en lui, c'est-à-dire depuis l'apparition du premier *homme parfait*—qui, entre parenthèses, n'est pas Adam.

Pour prouver que Jésus était Dieu, on nous présente son martyr sur la Croix et son sacrifice volontaire. Avant de croire à un «maître» l'égal du «Christ», il faudrait qu'il consentit à boire le calice que Jésus but à Gethsémani et pardonnât à ses bourreaux ses tortures physiques et morales. Etrange idée, en vérité! Mais c'est justement l'*insignifiance* de ces souffrances qui fait sourire chaque païen de pitié. Que sont trois ans de sermons et d'existence à la belle étoile, terminés par une souffrance de quelques heures sur la croix, comparés aux quatre-vingts années de torture *morale* de Gautama Bouddha, devant laquelle pâlissent toutes les tortures de la chair! Ah! Monsieur l'Abbé, il est plus difficile, plus méritoire et plus *divin*, de *vivre volontairement pour l'Humanité* que de mourir pour elle, et comment? d'une mort violente et inévitable à laquelle on essaye d'*échapper* en priant son Père céleste *de vous éviter*

* Voir mes notes (No. 5) à ce sujet dans un prochain numéro du *Lotus*.

ce calice. Car c'est là, mot pour mot, l'histoire des Évangiles. Allez donc intéresser un yogi ou un fakir fanatique à ces souffrances en les lui racontant *à la lettre*.*

On m'enseigne le vrai sens de la conversion de (saint) Paul, m'assurant que *je ne l'ai*

pas compris. Saint Paul, selon M. l'abbé Roca, était «un initié de l'école essénienne de Gamaliel, un vrai Thérapeute, un parfait Nazaréen, comme il nous l'apprend lui-même» (p. 261). Je le remercie de ces renseignements, mais je regrette de ne pouvoir les accepter. Un Essénien Nazareen équivaldrait à un brahme-bouddhiste; bien que nous ayons ouï parler d'un «brahme, prêtre bouddhiste», créature hybride qui aurait habité Paris jadis! Paul, quel qu'il fût ne pouvait être à la fois essénien et nazaréen, si par na-zaréen M. l'abbé entend la secte des *Nazars* de l'Ancient Testament dont la *Genèse* même fait mention. Les Esséniens avaient en horreur l'huile et le vin, tandis que les Nazars usaient des deux (Voir les *Nombres*, vi, 20). Les premiers ne reconnaissaient pas les «oints du Seigneur» et se servaient d'eau pour se laver plusieurs fois par jour, comme les Indous et les Bouddhistes; les Nazars, s'étant oints d'huile tout le corps, ne se lavaient jamais. Il est vrai que Paul nous dit dans l'*Épître aux Galatéens* (i, 15 et seq.) qu'il avait été «séparé» pour le service du Seigneur dès sa naissance, c'est-à-dire voué au *nazariat*; mais comme il dit ailleurs (*I Corinth.*, xi,14), que c'est une honte de porter les cheveux longs (ainsi qu'on représente Jésus et saint

*Je renvoie M. l'abbé aux récits de ce que M.Jaccoliot a vu aux Indes, et que tous ceux qui y ont vécu ont pu voir tous les jours. Regardez ces fanatiques yogis qui, à chaque nouvelle lune, s'accrochent par la peau du dos à un grappin en fer fixé à l'extrémité d'une tige horizontale au haut d'un long poteau. Ce bras, à bascule, les enlève en leur faisant faire le moulinet en l'air, jusqu'à ce que la chair sanglante se détachant, le martyr volontaire soit projeté à vingt pas de là. Voyez ces autres qui se brûlent journellement pendant de longues années le corps sur des charbons ardents, et ceux-ci qui se font enterrer jusqu'au cou, et restent ainsi exposés toute leur vie au soleil ardent, aux froids des nuits glaciales, à des milliers d'insectes et de bêtes fauves, sans compter la faim et la soif, et autres agréments de ce genre.

Jean), ceci prouve qu'il n'était resté Nazar * que jusqu'à sa conversion au Christos des Gnostiques. Jean-Baptiste était un vrai nazar, ainsi que Jean de l'*Apocalypse*, mais Saul cesse de l'être en devenant Paul. Donc, il n'était pas «un parfait Nazaréen». Il n'était pas non plus un Essénien, car ce que ceux-ci avaient de plus sacré après Dieu, c'était Moïse, sa *Genèse*, l'observation du Sabbat, et Paul avait renoncé à Moïse et au Sabbat. Que faire? M. l'abbé nous dit une chose, et l'histoire avec les deux Testaments, une tout autre chose.

Il est donc inutile de venir dire à des occultistes que «ce qui fut révélé à Paul, ce n'est donc pas du tout le Christos des Gnostiques mais bien le Chrestos avec tous les arcanes de son abaissement et de son anéantissement».

Ce *Chrestos* est justement le Chrestos-Christos des Gnostiques.

Paul n'a jamais été un apôtre du christianisme ecclésiastique, étant l'adversaire gnostique de Pierre. Nous avons comme preuve du fait les paroles authentiques de Paul, qu'on aura négligé de *revoir et de corriger*, et cette double note, cette dissonance qui court dans les *Épîtres*. Lorsque deux hommes sont en possession, je ne dirai pas de la vérité

absolue mais d'un fait avéré, d'une vérité relative, pourquoi l'un dit-il de l'autre *qu'il lui a résisté à la face* (*Gal.*, ii, 11), et pourquoi ce Paul montre-t-il tant de mépris pour la prétention qu'ont Pierre (Céphas), Jacques et Jean à être considérés comme les «piliers de l'Église»?

Il est également inutile de me renvoyer au docteur Sepp et à sa *Vie de N.-S. Jésus-Christ*. Je l'ai lue il y a vingt ans et n'y ai rien trouvé autre chose que fanatisme et plagiat conscient et inconscient de la religion des Brahmes. Ce n'est pas d'hier que nous connaissons le système chronosidéral de ce Bavarois à l'imagination si vive. On pourrait

* Le *Nazar*=le Séparé (Voyez *Genèse*, xlix, 26; *Nombres*, vi, 2; *Juges*, xiii, 5, etc.). Ce mot écrit sans les voyelles massorétiques, et se lisant, NZR, **\$&"**, donne la clef de sa signification cabbalistique dans ses trois lettres mêmes, car *noun* veut dire la *matrice*, la lettre **O**, la femme; *zayin*, l'emblème de la Souveraineté spirituelle, le *Sceptre*; et *resch*, la *tête*, le cercle. Le rasoir ne devait jamais toucher les cheveux ni la barbe du vrai Nazar.

dire beaucoup de choses curieuses sur son calcul du Saros, —salade japonaise composée des calculs de Pline et de Suidas. Mais je n'en dirai qu'une.* Tous nos théosophes connaissent la grande période ou *Mahayuga* dont les divisions nous ramènent toujours au chiffre 432. Ainsi, le *Kali-yuga* †—l'âge noir et néfaste des Brahmes, pendant lequel le monde expie les péchés des trois yougas précédents et qu'aucun *Avatar* ne viendra aider avant sa fin ‡ —le *Kali-yuga* durera 432,000 ans, alors que le total du *Maha-yuga*, composé des *Satya*, *Treta*, *Dwapara* et *Kali Yuga* fait 4,320,000 années. C'est un calcul mystique que les Brahmes ne donnent qu'à leurs Initiés, un calcul qui a fait dire à nos orientalistes, qui n'y voient goutte, bien des bêtises.§ Eh bien, le célèbre professeur de Munich a découvert le pot aux roses. Dans son tome I (p.9) voici la clef qu'il nous donne:

«C'est un fait affirmé [par Kepler] que toutes les planètes, au moment de l'incarnation, étaient en conjonction dans le signe du *Poisson* que les Juifs appelaient depuis l'origine des choses la *constellation du Messie*. C'est dans cette constellation que se trouvait l'étoile des mages» C'était la fameuse planète que tout le monde a pu voir cette année-ci, à Londres, la belle *Vénus-Lucifer* dont une tradition cabbalistique juive dit qu'elle absorbera un jour les 70 planètes qui président aux diverses nations du

* *Vie de N.-S. Jésus-Christ*, t.II, p.417.

[It is not clear to which edition of Dr. Sepp's work, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, H.P.B. refers. In the 2nd ed. of the French translation (Paris: Ve Poussièlgue-Rusand, 1861), which covers only the first part of the German original text, and does not go beyond it, the subject of the Saros is treated of in tome III, p. 331. This edition consists of one volume divided into three tomes, each one paged separately. The same subject is discussed in *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 655, footnote, where the same passage from Dr. Sepp is referred to, and partially quoted.—*Compiler*]

† Entre autres erreurs, M. Saint-Yves (*Mission des Juifs*) en fait l'âge d'or ou de renaissance spirituelle (N. de la D.).

‡ Voir mes notes (No. 6) à ce sujet, dans un prochain numéro du *Lotus*.

§ Voir mes notes à ce sujet (No. 7) dans un prochain numéro.

monde. Le docteur Sepp, lui, prétend qu'en vertu de ces prophéties naturelles, il était écrit dans les astres que le Messie devait paraître *dans l'année lunaire* du monde 4320, dans cette année mémorable où le «chœur entier des planètes fêtait son jubilé».*

Ainsi, pour admettre les lubies du docteur Sepp, publiées dans son «beau monument de la gnose chrétienne», nous devons, fermant les yeux et nous comprimant la cervelle,

1° Croire que le monde n'est vieux que de *six mille ans*—pas un jour de plus (Voir la *Genèse* et la chronologie de Moïse!):

2° Supposer que cette fameuse conjonction a eu lieu l'an 1 de notre ère, et non quatre ou cinq ans avant l'ère chrétienne comme l'a prouvé Kepler lui-même;

3° Oublier ce que nous savons pour faire triompher les fantaisies miraculeuses des ecclésiastiques: or, nous savons que ce calcul astronomique a été *emprunté* par les Juifs aux Chaldéens et à leurs 432,000 années dynastiques que ceux-ci avaient eux-mêmes tirées des 4,320,000 années du *Mahayuga* brahmanique.

Et il nous faudrait accepter ce beau passage «de la gnose» . . . bavaroise! Ce serait à croire que le Dr. Sepp l'a trouvé au fond d'une chope de bière, si on ne savait que, bien avant lui, le colonel Wilford qui fut si joliment berné par les Brahmes† au commencement de ce siècle,

* [Most of this paragraph occurs in de Mirville, *Pneumatologie*, etc., Vol. IV, p. 67, where reference is made to Dr. Sepp's work on the *Life of Christ*. It is not clear, however, what is meant by tome I, p. 9, nor what particular edition, German or French, it should apply to. However, in the 2nd ed. of the French translation (Paris, 1861), the conjunction of the planets and Kepler's views are spoken of in tome I, pp. 89-92, while the "choir of the planets" is mentioned in tome III, p. 369. *Vide* the Bio-Bibliographical Index for data on the various editions of Dr. Sepp's work.—*Compiler*.]

† Les Brahmes, ennuyés de la persistance que mettait le colonel Wilford à chercher Adam et Ève, Noé et ses trois fils, composèrent un joli *Pourâna* avec ces noms en sancrit qu'ils intercalèrent dans de vieux manuscrits. Sir William Jones lui-même y fut attrapé et avec lui l'Europe entière. Voyez *Introduction à la Science des religions* [Introduction to the Science of Religion] par Max Müller.

avait fait le fameux calcul, conservé jusqu'à ce jour, d'ailleurs, dans les volumes de la Bibliothèque de la Société Royale Asiatique à Calcutta et dans toutes les bibliothèques européennes. Encore une fois, M. l'abbé Roca veut-il que nous renoncions aux 4,320,000 années de notre *Maha-yuga* pour accepter les 4,320 *années lunaires* que le Dr. Sepp met entre la création du monde et la *Nativité*?

Après tout, il se pourrait que je contredisse moins M. l'abbé Roca que je ne crois, ainsi qu'il le dit. Tant mieux, tant mieux. D'ailleurs l'application de sa métaphore du «rayon blanc se décomposant en trois couleurs principales qui, etc.» se trouve dans mon *Isis Unveiled* (Vol. II, P. 639) écrit il y a près de douze ans.* Peut-être bien nous entendrons-nous donc un jour. En attendant, j'enverrai au *Lotus* quelques notes † sur les dernières paroles de Jésus crucifié, simplement pour montrer à M. l'abbé que nous, occultistes, nous *savons* ce que *quelques* Pères de l'Église ont *cru savoir*. D'où vient, par exemple, la tradition ésotérique (car les susdits Pères n'avaient pu le voir personnellement) que «le Christ, mourant sur la croix. tenait son visage tourné, ses yeux ouverts et ses bras tendus vers l'Occident»? Dans mes Notes j'expliquerai tout, sauf l'assertion que le *Crucifié* dont les mains étaient retenues par deux gros clous sur les deux branches latérales de la croix, avait «ses bras tendus vers

* Pour faire plaisir au lecteur, donnons ce passage de Mme Blavatsky:

« De même que le rayon blanc lumineux est décomposé par le prisme en les couleurs variées du spectre, ainsi le rayon de la divine vérité traversant le *triple* prisme de la nature humaine s'est brisé en fragments varicolores qu'on appelle RELIGIONS. Et, de même que les rayons du spectre, par dégradations de teinte imperceptibles, se fondent l'un dans l'autre, de même les grandes théologies qui se sont manifestées sous différents degrés de réfraction de la source originelle, se relient par des schismes secondaires, de petites écoles, des rejetons poussant de côté et d'autre. Combinés, ces éléments représentent une seule vérité éternelle; séparés, ils ne sont que les nuances de l'erreur humaine et les signes de l'imperfection». (N.de la D.)

† Voir dans un prochain numéro, Note No. 8.

l'Occident», tour de force difficile à réaliser pour un «crucifié». Mais ceci est un détail insignifiant.

En finissant, je dirai que je pense toujours que M. l'abbé s'illusionne et que son espoir est optimiste. Je tiens Victor Hugo pour un grand poète, mais je n'ai jamais entendu dire qu'il fût prophète. Quant au mot de la fin, ou de la faim, que décoche mon interlocuteur en guise d'adieu, je lui ferai observer: 1° que la misère et la crasse se retrouvent généralement partout où règne le prêtre catholique, et, 2°, que là-bas, prcs des Mahatmas, comme il dit, il n'y a point de pauvres pour la bonne raison qu'il n'y a point de riches; d'autres que les missionnaires menteurs y sont allés.

Et maintenant que j'ai répondu à l'abbé Roca, *prêtre catholique*, je terminerai cette trop longue réponse en m'adressant à M. Roca, mon critique et interlocuteur, aussi courtois

qu'il est spirituel lorsqu'il veut bien oublier sa soutane. C'est à ce dernier que j'exprime le sincère regret que j'éprouve d'avoir eu à parer tous ses coups et à le contredire en tout et partout. S'il considère cette réponse, ainsi que mes premières «Notes», comme une nouvelle «bourrade» il aura tort. Car si nous ne nous comprenons pas—quoiqu'il dise *me comprendre fort bien* lui—c'est que tout en parlant en apparence tous les deux la même langue, nos idées quant à la valeur et au sens de l'ésotérisme chrétien, de l'ésotérisme brahmo-bouddhiste et de celui des gnostiques, sont diamétralement opposées. Il puise ses conclusions et ses données ésotériques à des sources que je ne saurais connaître puisqu'elles sont d'invention moderne, tandis que moi je lui parle la langue des vieux Initiés et lui donne les conclusions de l'ésotérisme archaïque, qui, à leur tour, lui sont tout à fait étrangères à ce que je vois.

Pour définir avec précision, *sans ambages*, notre position réciproque, il me semble que, alors que je donne un aperçu ésotérique du Christos *universel*, c'est-à-dire du Logos impersonnel et anté-chrétien, lui me répond en s'appuyant sur le Christ sectaire de l'ère moderne, sur le Christ ecclésiastique et dogmatique dont le model est anté-chrétien. A l'ésotérisme de la vieille gnose qu'il

avoue perdu pour l'Église, il m'oppose l'ésotérisme scholastique du moyen âge. Il essaye de me donner le change avec des subtilités de théologiens et de Rose-croix qui, pour ne pas être brûlés tout vifs, se couvraient du voile de l'orthodoxie et affichaient un Christianisme contre lequel ils protestaient en secret. Dès lors, comment pourrait-on se comprendre? Quant à «mieux nous apprécier», je remercie M. l'abbé de son bon souhait, en doutant qu'il apprécie jamais *la rondeur de mes manières* ajoutée à la *haute franchise de mon verbe*; pour moi, je le prie de croire que j'ai toujours apprécié en lui l'habile écrivain au cœur libéral et large ainsi que le prêtre hardi qui a le rare courage de ses opinions.

D'ailleurs, *vera pro gratiis*, quand même se dicton devrait être suivi de son revers, *veritas odium parit*.

H. P. BLAVATSKY,

Secrétaire-correspondante de la Société Théosophique.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

216

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

REPLY TO THE MISTAKEN CONCEPTIONS OF THE ABBÉ ROCA CONCERNING MY OBSERVATIONS ON CHRISTIAN ESOTERICISM

H. P. BLAVATSKY

[*Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. II, No. 13, April, 1888, pp. 3-19]

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

In the February issue of *Le Lotus*, the Abbé speaks of a “drubbing” [*bourrade*] which he believes he received from me. At the same time, with a meekness which I will not call Christian—because the Christians are neither humble nor gentle in their polemics—but certainly Buddhistic, my interlocutor assures me that he bears me no ill-will. On the contrary, he says he is gratified by “my courteous manner and the complete frankness of my language,” quite natural results of my “Amazonian gait.”

A more cavilling mind than mine could find something to say to that. It would point out, perhaps, that such a superabundance of adjectives and personal epithets, in reply to observations on a subject as abstract as religious metaphysics, denotes quite the opposite of satisfaction. But Theosophists are but seldom flattered by their critics, and I myself have often received compliments more ill-turned than those the Abbé Roca lavishes on me. I should be wrong, therefore, not to appreciate his courtesy, especially since in his touching solicitude in considering my personality, and in order to do justice to my “virile intellect” and to my “masculine vigour,” the Abbé has consigned the theological Christ to the background and has not breathed a word about the *esoteric* Christ.

Now, as I have nothing to say of the first, and as I deny *in toto* the Christ invented by the Church, as well as all the doctrines, all the interpretations, and all the dogmas, ancient and modern, concerning that personage, I begin by declaring the Reply of the Abbé to my “Notes on

REPLY TO THE MISTAKEN CONCEPTIONS

217

Christian Esotericism” to be no answer at all. I do not find, in all his voluminous letter, one

single expression that would seriously contradict my objections, by refuting them logically and scientifically. Faith—and above all blind faith—cannot be “critically discussed”; in any case it can never be “scientifically established,” even though the Christian reader may be well satisfied with such casuistry. My interlocutor even bears me a grudge for having “displayed” what he pleases to call “such erudition.” That goes without saying. Against historical and valid arguments, he can offer as an objection only one single fact as “experimental” proof: Jesus Christ unceasingly telling him *in his soul* “that he is the *Unique* Master and the *only* true Doctor.” A feeble proof, indeed, in the face of science, law, and even the common sense of an unbeliever!

It is obvious that the famous paradox of Tertullian: “*Credo quia absurdum et impossibile est*”^{*} has nothing to do with a discussion of this kind. I thought I was addressing myself to the erudite mystic, to the socialistic and liberal Abbé Roca. Have I disturbed myself merely for a *priest*, a *fidei defensor*! The Abbé gets out of it by saying: “I know Buddhism well enough to understand her [me] easily; she does not know Christianity sufficiently well to readily catch my meaning.” Grieved as I am to contradict him, truth must nevertheless come before all else. The Abbé deceives himself in fancying he understands Buddhism; it is easy to see that he does not know it even *exoterically*, any more than Hinduism, even in its popular form. Otherwise would he have ever placed Krishna, as he does on page 259, among the Buddhas? Or again, would he have confused the name of a historical personage, Prince Gautama, with his mystical titles, enumerating them as so many Buddhas?

Does he not write, indeed, in speaking of Jesus, that the chalice from which he drank was “far more bitter than the cup from which Socrates in the West drank the hemlock, *or*

^{*} [This is the often misquoted sentence from Tertullian’s *Carne Christi*, ch. v, which runs: “*Certum est quia impossibile est*,” meaning “it is certain because it is impossible.”—*Compiler*.]

that . . . which Kṛishṣa, @âkyamuni, Gautama of Kapilavastu, Siddhârtha, and all the other Buddhas*” had drained? This “and all the other Buddhas” is a definite proof for us that the Abbé not only knows nothing of esoteric Buddhism, but has not the slightest idea of even the simple historical and popular biography of the great Hindu reformer. This is exactly as if, in speaking of Jesus, I should write: “Orpheus, the Son of Mary, Emmanuel, the Saviour, the Nazarene, and all the other Christs who have been crucified.” Without further wasting time in pointing out a number of *lapsus linguae* relating to Sanskrit, Brâhmanical and Buddhist terms scattered throughout the articles of the Abbé Roca—otherwise very learned articles and certainly very eloquent in style—that example is sufficient to permit the public to judge if my critic knows the first word of Buddhism in the present discussion. Can it be that the Abbé confounds it, as so many others have done, with Theosophy? In that case I may be allowed to inform him that Theosophy is neither

Buddhism, Christianity, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Hinduism, nor any other *ism*: it is the *esoteric synthesis* of the known religions and philosophies.

Surely I must know something of Christianity—the popular and especially the exoteric—to allow myself to enter the lists against so erudite a Catholic priest as my adversary. Should one not say rather (admitting for the moment that I have not been able “to catch at once” *the Christianity of the Abbé Roca*) that my esteemed interlocutor is not too well aware of what he preaches? That, having thrown to the windmills his cap of an *orthodox* and *papistical* ecclesiastic, ignoring the true esotericism of the Brâhmanas and the Buddhists, of the Pagan and Christian Gnostics, as well as of the authentic Chaldean Kabbalah, and knowing nothing of the doctrines of the Theosophists, he has fabricated for himself a Christianity of his own, an Esotericism *sui generis*? I confess that I do not understand him.

* This title, thanks to the kindness of Monsieur Gaboriau, did not appear at all with the others in *Le Lotus*, but I have the first proofs where it is found in the order indicated above.

Of his “*Law of Ram*” and his “*Ab-Ram, issue of Ram*” (?) —I know nothing. I know perfectly well the VAṂĀVALI or genealogy of the Sûrya and the Chandra races * from Ikshvâku and Budha † to Râma and KṣishṢa, the common source whence the *PurâṢas* (ancient *Scriptures*), the *Bhâgavata*, the *Skanda*, the *Agni* and the *Bhavishya-PurâṢa*, have drawn their divine, human, and dynastic genealogies. A copy of it is to be found in the royal library of the *Mahârâjâs* of Udaipur (the most ancient of the Indian royal houses, whose family genealogy has been examined and sanctioned by the Anglo-Indian government). Râma is a *historical* personage. The ruins of cities built by him and *buried under several successive strata of other cities*, more recent but still *prehistoric*, still exist in India; they are known as well as the ancient coins with his effigy and name. What then is this “*Ab-Ram, issue of Ram*”? ‡ A-bram or *A-brahm*, in Sanskrit, means a *non-BrâhmaṢa*, hence a man driven out from the Brahmin caste, or a man of inferior caste. *Abra* is the name of Indra’s elephant; its female is called *Abramu*. The words are Sanskrit, and the name *Abramu* is found

* Sûrya and Chandra (Solar and Lunar) are terms used respectively for the two great primitive and radical races of Âryâvarta, called the Solar and Lunar Races.

† I hope the reader will avoid confounding Budha (with one *d*) the son of *Soma*, the Moon, with the mystical title of Buddha (two *d*’s). The one is the proper name of an individual (Budha, Intelligence or Wisdom), the other is the title of the Sages, the “Illuminated.”

‡ It is not the tribes of the proud Râjputs of the Solar race, *Sûryavaṅa*—tribes which *historically prove* their descent from Lava and Kuṅa, the two sons of Râma—who would acknowledge this unknown “*Ab-Ram*.” See my note No. I on Abraham in a forthcoming number of *Le Lotus*.

[In the course of this essay, H.P.B. refers eight different times to certain Notes, numbered from I to 8, which she seems to have written for some forthcoming issue of *Le Lotus*. Such Notes have not been found in any later issue of this journal, and are certainly not the footnotes which she appended, in the June, 1888, issue of *Le Lotus*, to the final installment of this controversy with the Abbé Roca. So it is impossible to say at the present time what particular Notes were meant.—*Compiler*.]

again in Chaldea, but the Abraham of the Jews has nothing to do with the Hindu Râma; * he cannot have issued from the latter, for it is Râma, on the contrary, who has issued from Brahman (neuter) through his terrestrial aspect, VishŚu, of which he is the Avatâra. †

This is simply a digression which the Abbé may perhaps call another “thrashing” [*bourrade*]. *À propos* of this, I would say he must be very thin-skinned, as I do not see, in my “Notes on Christian Esotericism,” anything that could have given rise to such an idea in the imagination of my honorable interlocutor. The puff of wind which knocks down a house of cards may easily pass for a heavy squall in the eyes of the architect who built it; but if the Abbé Roca lays the blame on the puff, rather than on the weakness of his edifice, it is certainly not my fault. He also accuses me of *partisanship*; that is an accusation as unjust as the other. As I am neither a priest nor under the ferocious rod of a Church which declares itself infallible, *I, myself, am ready to accept the truth from whence it comes*. My critic, less fortunate than myself, finding himself between the hammer and the anvil, cannot accept my conclusions, and forthwith tries to attribute them to my “partisanship,” and my “ignorance” of his religion. Once again, the spirit of partisanship cannot exist in a Society as universal and impartial as ours, which has chosen for its motto “There is no religion higher than Truth.” Our Masters being Sages far too great to bedizen themselves with the peacock’s feathers of infallibility or even to boast of the possession of absolute Truth, their disciples always keep an open mind to facts which can be demonstrated to them. Let the Abbé demolish the proofs we offer against the existence of a carnalized Christ, hence *Christ-Man*, whether called Jesus or KṛishŚa; let him

* *Ab, Aba* means “father,” but only in the Semitic tongues.

† We must draw the reader’s attention, in passing, to the importance of these remarks, because the works of Fabre d’Olivet and Saint-Yves d’Alveydre are based upon data completely out of harmony with them.—Editor, *Le Lotus*.

demonstrate that there has never been any other incarnated God than his “Jesus-Christ,”

and that this one is the “only” as well as the “greatest” of the Masters and Doctors—not only the greatest of the Mahâtman but *God in person!* Very good; then let him give us proofs, irrefutable or at least as logical and evident as those advanced by us. But he must not come offering as proof the voice which speaks in his soul, or quotations drawn from the Gospels. Because his voice—were it even the twin-sister of that of the *daimôn* of Socrates—has no more value in the discussion, for us or for the public, than has for him or for any other person, the voice which tells me to the contrary in *my* soul. Yes, he is right in saying that “it is so difficult to rid oneself of all personal interest, and, still more, of all partisanship of school, sect, church, caste”; as that sentence could in no way apply to me, for I do not hold to any special school nor belong to any sect, Church or caste, since I am a *Theosophist*, would it not apply to him, Christian, Catholic, Ecclesiastic and Canon?

In general, our esteemed correspondent must have a rather lively imagination. For now he imagines the Editor of *Le Lotus* “intoxicated by the heady fumes” of his eulogies of the knowledge of the Mahâtman and “nodding and winking” at him. If so, the Editor must be “melancholy in his cups” since, instead of thanking him for his flattering advances (flattering, according to him), the Editor sends the Abbé’s first article to me in London, so that I may answer it, and follows it by my “thrashing.” Our facts and intentions do not agree with the ideas the Abbé Roca has of them. It is true that he has warned his readers that “no one would suspect this lady [his humble servant] of toadyism in respect to Catholic priests.” That is an incontestable and *historical* fact; it is indeed the only one I find in his long epistle. If, having the experience of a long life passed in studying the above-mentioned priests, I have put an extinguisher on the rosy hopes which shone in the flame of his first letter, it is because I could not take seriously the simple compliments of civility addressed to the *pagan* Mahâtman by a Christian and a French Abbé, and because, even if the Editor of the French *Lotus* could be

deceived, the Editor of the English *Lucifer* had seen through them.* While sincerely appreciating the Abbé Roca as a writer, and while in my thoughts distinguishing the mystical philosopher from the priest, I cannot, however, lose sight of his cassock. So the homage he renders to the wisdom of our Masters, instead of *intoxicating me by its heady fumes*, immediately appeared to me under its true guise. This homage plays the part of a greasy pole erected to serve as a support for Christian gewgaws attached to it in profusion, by an apostolic and Roman hand, or of a Hindu-Theosophic doll bedecked with Popish amulets. † Far from being *intoxicated*—I confess with my usual “frankness” and my *unambiguous* rudeness—I feel but a redoubled mistrust.

The misconceptions with which the Abbé’s Reply abounds prove how right I was. Did he expect the Editor of *Le Lotus* and the Theosophists to cry out in chorus: *Mea culpa!* and be converted *en masse* to his ideas? We see him, after the first reply from them, parrying imaginary blows, and, in a second letter, giving an entirely different colour to the compliments of his first article. He certainly has the right to do this; better than anyone else

he must know the real meaning of his own thoughts. But this applies to everyone, I believe. Why then does he proceed to *disfigure* what I say, and even to invent *impossible* scenes and cases where he makes me play a strange part, and attributes to

* We hardly dare claim we catch Madame Blavatsky's idea, but we believe that in the present case we have not been deceived. We have generously offered the Abbé Roca a forum; in this he has expressed his ideas which Madame Blavatsky refutes with a masterly hand; other writers express and will express their own ideas herein, because the object of *Le Lotus* is to instruct its readers, by giving from time to time the opinions of eminent minds who may differ from us on some points. —Editor, *Le Lotus*.

† Madame Blavatsky judges according to the spirit and the terms of the article under consideration. We happen to know that the Abbé Roca is eloquently fulminating against Leo XIII, but the latter, stricken with an incurable deafness, cannot hear him. Moreover, one cannot wake the dead, and it is better to leave them alone, in order to occupy oneself with the *living*.—Editor, *Le Lotus*.

REPLY TO THE MISTAKEN CONCEPTIONS

223

me words that he certainly did not find in my “Notes” written in answer to his December article? The fundamental idea of my observations was in fact that he who would say “*Ego sum veritas*” is yet to be born; that the “*Vos Dii estis*” applies to all, and that every man born of woman is “the son of God,” whether he be good, bad, or neither the one nor the other. Either the Abbé Roca is obstinately determined not to understand me, or he has an ulterior purpose. I do not at all object to his mistaking the thundering voice of his Latin Church for the one he thinks he hears in *the depth of his soul*, but I do most emphatically object to his representing me as sharing the dogmas which have been thus inculcated in him, when in reality I repudiate them completely.

Judge for yourself. I write in every letter that a divine Christ (or *Christos*) has never existed *under a human form* outside the imagination of blasphemers who have carnalized *a universal and entirely impersonal principle*. I venture to believe that this is perfectly clear. Well, the Abbé Roca, after having represented me as saying “I am the Truth”—an absurdity I leave to the Churches who discovered it, and at which an Adept, a Sage, would smile in pity—allows himself to make the following assertion:

. . . . it happens that another presented himself to the world who said squarely, “I am the TRUTH—*Ego sum Veritas*”! That is the language of Christ, and if it did not reveal God Himself, it would betray him as the most shameless of impostors. Now to say in the presence of Madame Blavatsky that Christ is an impostor should be carefully avoided, because she would reply with an outright smack on the mouth of the blasphemer. Draw your own conclusions then. . . .

Draw your own conclusions!!!. . .

What conclusions may or may not be drawn by others interests me very little. But I will draw my own conclusions, for, I believe, I understand.

There are two possibilities:

a. Either the Abbé has no clear idea of what Theosophy is, of its real doctrines, or of myself, the humble disciple of Truth, and speaks to the winds and at random;

b. Or he wants to corner me, to force me to explain myself, so as to get a categorical answer from me.

The reasoning would not be bad. Either Madame Blavatsky will pass in silence that assertion which is as extraordinary as it is false—silence means consent or she will reply by contradicting and denying it; in the latter case she will make fresh enemies among the Christians, and that would be so much gained.

Is that so, Monsieur l'Abbé? Then it is just one more miscalculation. The “amazon” will have this time, as well as on other occasions, enough “masculine vigour” to reply without ambiguity and in the very face of the universe, what she thinks of your little arrangement. In fact, to say that Christ (we say *Christos*) is an *impostor* would be to proffer, not a *blasphemy*, but a simple stupidity: a personal adjective cannot be applied to an ideal principle, to an abstraction; it would be like saying: “Infinite Space is a devotee.” An Occultist-Theosophist would laugh. As to the supposition that I am capable of replying “with an outright smack” on the mouth of the one who would proffer the expression, that is still more grotesque. The Abbé forgets that I am first of all a Theosophist, and is probably ignorant that I am personally a disciple of the Buddhist philosophy. Now a true Buddhist would not even strike a dog to stop him from barking. The Buddhists *practice* all the virtues preached in the “Sermon on the Mount” of Gayâ—on the Mount of Galilee six centuries later—virtues which are heard of but rarely in the churches of the Christian countries, and that are practised still less frequently. The Buddhists do not resist, they do not return evil for evil; they leave the glory of smacking, of cutting off the ears of their adversaries, to those like saint Peter who in that way defend their Master, only to betray and deny him two hours later, according to the sad story. Does the Abbé wish to know, *without ambiguity*, what I really think of the Christian legend? It is easy for me to satisfy him.

For me Jesus Christ, *i.e.*, the Man-God of the Christians, copied from the Avatâras of every country, from the Hindu Kṛishṣā as well as the Egyptian Horus, was never a

historical person. He is a deified personification of the glorified type of the great Hierophants of the Temples,* and his story, as told in the New Testament, is an allegory, assuredly containing profound esoteric truths, but still an allegory. It is interpreted by the help of the seven keys, similarly to the *Pentateuch*. This theory of the seven keys, the

Church, according to the Abbé Roca, has simplified “without disfiguring it,” reducing the keys to three; while, on the contrary, it has fabricated three false keys which do not open anything. The legend of which I speak is founded, as I have demonstrated over and over again in my writings and my notes, on the existence of a personage

* Every act of the Jesus of the New Testament, every word attributed to him, every event related of him during the three years of the mission he is said to have accomplished, rests on the programme of the Cycle of Initiation, a cycle founded on the Precession of the Equinoxes and the Signs of the Zodiac. When the Hebrew Gospel not *according to* but *by* Matthew the Gnostic, of whom they have made an Evangelist— the Gospel of which (saint) Jerome spoke in the IVth century and which he refused to translate on the pretext that it was falsified (!) by Seleucus, the Manichaeian disciple (See Hieronymus, *De viris illust.*, cap. 3)—when, I say, that *original* document shall have been translated, if ever it is found, and the Christian Churches will have at least *one* document not falsified, then only will it be feasible to speak of the “life of Jesus,” of the events of which “no one is ignorant.” Meanwhile, and without losing time arguing the subject of the century in which Jesus or Jehoshua lived, one fact is certain, namely that the Occultists are prepared to prove that even the sacramental words attributed to him on the cross have been *disfigured*, and that they mean something quite different from what the Greek translation conveys. See my additional notes (No. 2) in a forthcoming number of *Le Lotus*.

[H.P.B.’s reference to St. Jerome’s *De viris illustribus liber*, chap. 3, is only partially correct. The main point of Jerome’s argument, and the mention of Seleucus, occur rather in his letter to the Bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus, as can be ascertained by consulting St. Jerome’s *Opera*, Vol. V, col. 445 (Johannis Martianay, Paris, 1706). H.P.B. uses the same argument in her article on “The Origin of the Gospels and the Bishop of Bombay” (*The Theosophist*, Vol. IV, No. 1, October, 1882, pp. 6-9), and again in the third instalment of her essay on “The Esoteric Character of the Gospels” (*Lucifer*, Vol. I, No. 6, February, 1888, pp. 490-96). *Vide* Compiler’s Notes to this latter essay for comprehensive survey of the various references and quotations used by her, and their complete text.—*Compiler*.]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

226

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

called Jehoshua (from which Jesus has been made) born at Lüd or Lydda about 120 years before the modern era. And if this fact is denied—to which I can hardly object—one must resign oneself to regard the hero of the drama of Calvary as a myth pure and simple. As a matter of fact, in spite of all the desperate research made during long centuries, if we set aside the testimony of the “Evangelists,” *i.e.*, unknown men whose identity has never been established, and that of the *Fathers* of the Church, interested fanatics, neither history, nor profane tradition, neither official documents, nor the contemporaries of the *soi-disant* drama, are able to provide one single serious proof of the historical and real existence, not only of the Man-God but even of him called Jesus of Nazareth, from the year 1 to the year 33. All is darkness and silence. Philo Judaeus, born before the Christian Era, and dying quite some time after the year when, according to Renan, the hallucination of a hysterical woman, Mary of Magdala, gave a God to the world, made several journeys to Jerusalem during that interval of forty-odd years. He went there to write the history of the religious sects of his epoch in Palestine. No writer is more correct in his descriptions, more careful to omit nothing; no community, no fraternity, even the most insignificant, escaped him. Why then does he not speak of the Nazarites? Why does he not make the least allusion to the Apostles, to the *divine* Galilean, to the Crucifixion? The answer is easy. Because the biography of Jesus was *invented after the first century*, and no one in Jerusalem was better informed on the subject than Philo himself. We have but to read the quarrel of Irenaeus with the Gnostics in the 2nd century, to be certain of it. Ptolemaeus (180 A.D.), having remarked that Jesus preached *one year* according to the legend, and that he was too young to have been able to teach anything of importance, Irenaeus had a bad fit of indignation and testified that Jesus preached more than ten or *even twenty years!* Tradition alone, he said, speaks of *ten years* (*Contra Haereses*, lib. II, cap. 22, para. 4-5). Elsewhere, he makes Jesus die at the age of *fifty years or more!!* Now, if as early as the year 180, a Father of the Church had recourse to tradition, and if no

REPLY TO THE MISTAKEN CONCEPTIONS

227

one was sure of anything, and no great importance was attributed to the Gospels—to the *Logia* of which there were more than sixty—what place has history in all of this? Confusion, lies, deceit, and forgery, such is the ledger of the early centuries. Eusebius of

Caesarea, king of falsifiers, inserted the famous 16 lines referring to Jesus in a manuscript of Josephus, to get even with the Gnostics who denied that there ever had been a *real* personage named Jesus.* Still more: he attributed to Josephus, a fanatic who died as he had lived, a stubborn Jew, the reflection that it is perhaps not correct to call him (Iasous) a man ("<ZD), because he was the Lord's *Anointed, i.e., the Messiah!!* (*Vide* Josephus, *Antiq.*, lib. XVIII, cap. iii, 3.)†

But what use is it to waste time repeating what every well-educated man knows. The Abbé continually refers us to the Gospels and to St. Paul, and, showering on us a torrent of quotations, triumphantly demands: "Is this clear enough? Did not Christ *himself* say this and that, and does not St. Paul assure us that. . . etc., etc., . . ." It is hardly necessary to say that for the words of Jesus to possess any value as proof, the authenticity of the Gospels must first be proved. Jesus, whether he lived at that epoch or earlier, *never wrote anything*, and what he has been made to say in the four Gospels is sometimes terribly contradictory. As to Paul, undoubtedly a historical personage, it would be difficult to separate, in his writings, what he said himself and what his editors and correctors have made him say. However, there remains—doubtless by inadvertence—one expression, by him or by his collaborators, which sums up in two words what was thought about Jesus. Look up the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, ii, 9; you will read there that Jesus was made "*inferior to the angels.*" That is enough for us.

* Add to this that he invented the famous monogram for the *Labarum* of Constantine (a combination of X *Chi*, and P *Rho*, initials of *Christos* which he applied to Jesus) and fabricated the vision of that Emperor. But Gibbon and other historians have judged Eusebius long ago, and his value is well known now. See my notes (No. 3), on this subject, in a forthcoming number of *Le Lotus*.

† [Also 63-64, acc. to the pagination of the Greek text.—*Compiler.*]

Can one who is *inferior* to the angels be God, the Infinite and the Only?

Indeed, every man, every *Ju-su* (name of Horus, Khonsu, the Son, the type of humanity), above all, every initiate whose body is made inferior to that of the angels, can say, in the presence of his *Âtman* (Divine Spirit): *Vivit vero in me Christus*, as he would say: Krishna, Buddha, or Ormuzd lives in me.* After having repeated what I said in my "Notes" about the *Christos* developing only through the *Chrestos*, the Abbé, as if he were saying something new which *emanated from him*, exclaims in threatening tone that no one will enter into that glorified body except by the "strait gate and narrow way." For him, this is the blessed *NirvâṢa*, and he continues to preach what we have been preaching for twelve years and what I repeated in my "Notes." He must let me complete what he leaves in such fine shape, unable to find that path except in the bosom of his Church, of his own faith. Unfortunately his *angusta porta, et arcta via* can apply neither to his Church nor to his faith. In that Church where *everything is bought*, crimes and indulgences, amulets and

beatitudes (on earth, at least; as to Heaven—after me the Deluge!), the *way* and the *gate* become wider in proportion to the sums paid by the faithful. Be gone, religion of Judas! It was to (saint) Peter that his Master said: VADE RETRO SATANAS! The proof of this is in the Gospel itself, I say, repeating the customary expression of the Abbé Roca.

He sends me to Damascus that I may become “a perfect initiate and the greatest of Christian Buddhists” (?).

* In Hebrew, man or *Aïsh* (⋆!⋆) gives this other form by Kabalistic derivation ⋆!⋆ Jesh, in Greek and in French *Jes-us*, signifying at once *fire, sun, divinity*, and *man*. This word (with its masoretic points) was pronounced ⋆!⋆ *ish* or *Jesh, man* in this case. The feminine form was %⋆!⋆ *Issa, woman*; in Egyptian *Isi-s, Isis*. The collateral form of it was ⋆!⋆ *Jesse*, or *Isi*, of which the feminine in Egyptian was *Isi-s*. But *Isi* is the equivalent of *Jesse*, the father of David, of the race from which came Jesus, *Jes-us*. It is necessary that one should know the Mystery language and that of Symbolism before speaking with so much authority, and that language the Church has lost. See my notes (No. 4), in a forthcoming number of *Le Lotus*.

REPLY TO THE MISTAKEN CONCEPTIONS

229

What would he say if I told him that it is after long years passed in the state of *Chrêstos*, after thirty years of physical and moral martyrdom, that I have got there, and that it is precisely on that glorious path that I have discovered that the Churches, which style themselves *Christian*, are nothing but whited sepulchres filled with the dead bones of esoteric paganism and moral putrefaction. So I prefer by far to remain the humblest of esoteric Buddhists than the greatest of orthodox and exoteric Christians. I have the most profound respect for the transcendental idea of the universal *Christos* (or Christ) which lives in the soul of the Bushman and the savage Zulu, as well as in that of the Abbé Roca, but I have the keenest aversion for the *Christolatry* of the Churches. I hate those dogmas and doctrines which have degraded the ideal Christos by making of it an absurd and grotesque anthropomorphic fetish, a jealous and cruel idol which damns for eternity those who decline to bow down before it.* The least of the Gnostic Docetae

* It is so much the easier for me to prove the solid foundation of my repugnance, since in order to support my statements, I have merely to open *The Tablet*, the leading organ of the English *Roman Catholics*. Here is an excerpt from it:

“The official statement as to the moral and material progress of India which has recently been published, supplies a very interesting contribution to the controversy on the missionary question. *It appears from these figures that while we effect a very marked moral deterioration in the natives by converting them to our creed, their natural standard of morality is so high that, however much we Christianize them, we cannot succeed in making them altogether as bad as ourselves.* The figures representing the proportions of criminality in the several classes, are as follows:—Europeans, 1 in 274; Eurasians, 1 in 509; Native Christians, 1 in 799; Mohammedans, 1 in 856; *Hindus, 1 in 1361; and Buddhists, 1 in 3787.* The last item is a magnificent tribute to the exalted purity of Buddhism, but the statistics are instructive throughout, and enforce with resistless power the conclusion that, as a mere

matter of social polity, we should do much better if we devoted our superfluous cash and zeal, for a generation or two, to the ethical improvement of our own countrymen, instead of trying to upset the morality, together with the theology, of people who might reasonably send out missions to convert us.”
What a superb confession!

who claimed that Jesus crucified was nothing but an *illusion*, and his story an allegory, was much nearer the truth than a “saint” Augustin or even an “Angel of the Schools.” A pagan living a simple and patriarchal life, loving his neighbour and doing his duty, is a thousand times nearer the *angusta porta, et arcta via* than was ever a (saint) Cyril, the ferocious murderer of Hypatia, or a (saint) Constantine, probably beatified because he killed his son with his own hands, boiled monks in pitch, disemboweled his wife, and made himself as miserably famous as Nero. *

Oh, the Abbé informs us, “if the sublime conception of that Christian ideal [the *Christos* living within man] is that of the Mahâtman, honour to them!” That ideal is not Christian, nor has it been invented by the Mahâtman; *it was the apotheosis of the Mysteries of Initiation*. As to the “Word made Flesh,” it is the heritage of the whole of humanity, received by man the moment the universal Soul incarnated in him, *i.e.*, from the appearance of the first *perfect man*—who, by the way, was not Adam.

By way of proving that Jesus was God, we are offered his martyrdom on the Cross and his voluntary sacrifice. Before believing a “Master” the equal of “Christ,” he should have to agree to drink from the chalice that Jesus drained at Gethsemane and to pardon his executioners for his moral and physical tortures. A strange idea, truly! But it is exactly the *insignificance* of those sufferings that makes every pagan smile in pity. What are three years of sermons and of living in the open, ended by a few hours of suffering on the cross, compared with the eighty years of *moral* torture of Gautama the Buddha, before which all the tortures of the flesh fade into insignificance! Ah, Monsieur l’Abbé, it is more difficult, more meritorious and more *divine, to live voluntarily for Humanity* than to die for it. And how? By a violent and inevitable death from which *escape* is attempted by praying his heavenly Father *to*

* See my notes (No. 5) on this subject in a forthcoming number of *Le Lotus*.

remove the chalice. For that is, word for word, the narrative of the Gospels. Are you going

to interest a yogi or a fanatical fakir in those sufferings if you interpret them to him *literally!* *

Being assured that *I have not understood it*, I am instructed in the true meaning of the conversion of (saint) Paul. Saint Paul, according to the Abbé Roca, was “an initiate of the Essenian School . . . a perfect Nazarite, as he tells us himself” (p. 261). I thank him for this information, but regret being unable to accept it. A Nazarite-Essene would be the equivalent of a Brâhman-Buddhist; albeit we have heard a hybrid creature said formerly to have lived in Paris, spoken of as a “Brâhman-Buddhist priest”! Paul, whatever he might have been, could not have been at the same time an Essene and a Nazarite, if by Nazarite is meant the *Nazar* sect of the Old Testament, mentioned even in *Genesis*. The Essenes had a horror of oil and wine, while the Nazars made use of both (see *Numbers*, vi, 20). The former did not recognize the “*anointed* of the Lord” and used water to wash themselves several times daily, like the Hindus and Buddhists; the Nazars never washed but anointed themselves all over with oil. It is true that Paul tells us in the *Epistle to the Galatians* (i, 15 *et seq.*) that he had been “*separated*” for the Lord’s service from his birth: *i.e.*, pledged to the *nazarship*; but, as he says elsewhere (*I Cor.*, xi, 14) that it is a shame to wear long hair (as Jesus and St. John are represented as doing),

* I refer the Abbé to the accounts of what Monsieur Jacolliot saw in India, and which all who have lived there could see at any time. Consider those fanatical yogis who, at each new moon, hang themselves by the skin of the back to an iron hook fixed at the end of a horizontal branch on the top of a high post. This arm, like a see-saw, lifts them high in the air and makes them twirl round till the bleeding flesh breaks away and the voluntary martyr is hurled perhaps twenty paces. Look at those who, for long years, burn their bodies over hot coals every day, and those who bury themselves to the neck and remain thus all their lives exposed to the blazing sun, the cold of freezing nights, the myriads of insects and savage beasts, not to mention hunger and thirst and other delights of that kind.

this proves that he remained a Nazar * only until his conversion to the Christos of the Gnostics. John the Baptist was a real Nazar, also John of the *Apocalypse*, but Saul ceased to be so when he became Paul. So then, he was not a “perfect Nazarite.” He was no longer an Essene either, because what they held as most sacred after God was Moses, his *Genesis*, and the observance of the Sabbath, and Paul had renounced Moses and the Sabbath. What are we to do? The Abbé tells us one thing, and history with both Testaments, quite another.

So it is quite useless to tell the occultists that “what was revealed to Paul was not by any means the Christos of the Gnostics . . . but really the *Chrestos* with all the arcana of his abasement and of his annihilation.” This *Chrestos* is exactly the Chrestos-Christos of the Gnostics. Paul was never an apostle of ecclesiastical Christianity, being the Gnostic adversary of Peter. As proof of this fact we have the authentic words of Paul, which were overlooked in the *revision and correction*, and the double meaning, that disharmony which

runs through the Epistles. If two men are in possession, I will not say of the absolute truth but of a fact established by evidence, in other words, of a relative truth, why does the one say of the other *that he withstood him to his face* (*Gal.*, ii, 11), and why does Paul show such contempt for the claim of Peter (Cephas), James and John to be considered as “pillars of the Church”?

It is equally useless to refer me to Dr. Sepp and his *Life of Christ*. I read it twenty years ago and found nothing else but fanaticism and plagiarism, conscious or unconscious, of the religion of the BrâhmaṢas. It is not just from yesterday that we have known the chrono-sidereal system of this Bavarian with a lively imagination. Many

* *Nazar*=the Separated (See *Genesis*, xlix, 26; *Numbers*, vi, 2; *Judges*, xiii, 5, etc.). This word, when written without the masoretic points, and reading NZR, **\$&**, actually yields the key to its Kabalistic significance in its three letters, because *nun* signifies the *matrix*, the letter O, the woman; *zayin*, the emblem of spiritual Sovereignty, the *Sceptre*; and *resh*, the *head*, the circle. The razor was never allowed to touch the hair or beard of the true *Nazar*.

REPLY TO THE MISTAKEN CONCEPTIONS

233

curious things could be said of his calculation of the Saros—a Japanese salad composed of the calculations of Pliny and Suidas. I will mention but one.* Every Theosophist knows of the great period of *Mahâ-yuga* whose divisions always lead us back to the figure 432. Thus *Kali-yuga*†—the black and evil age of the BrâhmaṢas, during which the world expiates the sins of the three preceding yugas and to whose help no *Avatâra* will come before its close ‡—will last 432,000 years, while the total of the *Mahâ-yuga*, made up of the *Satya*, *Tretâ*, *Dwâpara* and *Kali-Yugas* makes 4,320,000 years. This is a mystical calculation that the BrâhmaṢas give only to their Initiates, a calculation which has made our Orientalists, who can make nothing of it, utter many absurdities.§ Well, the celebrated Munich professor has let the cat out of the bag. In Volume I (p. 9) of his book, he gives us the following key:

“It is an asserted fact [by Kepler] that at the moment of the incarnation, all the planets were in conjunction in the sign of the *Fishes* which the Jews called, from the beginning of things, the *constellation of the Messiah*. The Star of the Magi was found in that constellation . . .” This was the famous planet that everyone in London could see this year, the beautiful Venus-Lucifer of which a

* *Vie de N.-S. Jésus-Christ*, Vol. II, p. 417.

[It is obvious that both H.P.B. and the Abbé Roca have in mind the German work of Johann Nepomuk Sepp (1816-1909), entitled *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, originally published in seven volumes at Regensburg, 1843-46 (4th ed., 1898-1902), entitled *Das Leben Jesu*. We have left in H.P.B.’s footnote the title of the French translation of this work by Charles Sainte-Foi (Paris: Ve Poussielgue-Rusand, 1854, 2nd ed., *ibid.*, 1861), as it is almost certain that reference is to such a translation. *Vide* Compiler’s footnote on p. 211 of the

present Volume.—*Compiler.*]

† Among other errors, Saint-Yves d'Alveydre (*Mission des Juifs*) makes of it the Golden Age, the age of spiritual rebirth.—Editor, *Le Lotus*.

‡ See my notes on this subject (No. 6), in a forthcoming number of *Le Lotus*.

§ See my notes on this subject (No. 7), in a forthcoming issue.

Kabalistic Jewish tradition says that it will one day absorb the 70 planets which preside over the various nations of the world. As to Dr. Sepp, he claims that in virtue of these natural prophecies it was written in the stars that the Messiah had to appear *in the lunar year* of the world 4320, in that memorable year when the “whole choir of planets was in jubilee.” *

Thus, to admit Dr. Sepp's whimsical notions published in his “fine monument to the Christian Gnosis,” we must, while closing our eyes and compressing our brains:

(1) Believe that the world is only *six thousand years* old—not a day more. (Long live *Genesis* and the Chronology of Moses!)

(2) Assume that this famous conjunction took place in the year 1 of our era, and not four or five years before the Christian era as Kepler himself proved.

3) Forget what we know in order to allow the miraculous fantasies of the ecclesiastics to be triumphant. Now, we know that this astronomical calculation was *borrowed* by the Jews from the Chaldeans, from their 432,000 dynastic years, which they themselves had received from the 4,320,000 years of the Brâhmanical *Mahâ-yuga*.

And we should have to accept that fine passage “of the gnosis” from Bavaria! We would be inclined to believe that Dr. Sepp had found it at the bottom of a pot of beer, did we not know that long before him Col. Wilford, who was so nicely tricked by the BrâhmaṢas † at the beginning of this century, had himself made the famous calculation, preserved to this day, by the way, in the volumes of the Royal Asiatic Society's Library in Calcutta, and in all the European libraries. To repeat, does the Abbé Roca wish us to abandon the 4,320,000 years of our *Mahâ-yuga* in

* [*Vide* Compiler's footnote on p. 212 of the present Volume.]

† The BrâhmaṢas, annoyed at the persistence with which Col. Wilford searched for Adam and Eve, Noah and his three sons, composed a pretty little *PurâṢa* with those names in Sanskrit, which they inserted in some old manuscripts. Sir William Jones himself was caught by this, and with him the whole of Europe. See *Introduction to the Science of Religion*, by Max Müller.

order to accept the 4,320 *lunar years* that Dr. Sepp puts between the Creation of the World and the *Nativity*?

After all, it may be that I contradict the Abbé Roca less than I imagine, as he himself says. So much the better, so much the better. Furthermore, the application of his metaphor of the “white ray decomposing into three principal colours which, etc.” is found in my *Isis Unveiled* (Vol. II, p. 639) written nearly twelve years ago. * Perhaps some day, then, we shall understand each other. In the meantime, I will send *Le Lotus* some notes † on the last words of Jesus crucified, simply to show the Abbé that we, occultists, *know* what *some* Fathers of the Church *believed they knew*. Whence came, for instance, the esoteric tradition (because the aforesaid Fathers could not have seen him personally) that “Christ, dying on the cross . . . held his face turned, his eyes opened, and his arms extended towards the West”? In my Notes I shall explain everything, except the assertion that the *Crucified*, whose hands were restrained by two big nails to the two lateral arms of the cross, had “his arms extended towards the West,” a feat difficult to be performed by a “crucified one.” But that is an insignificant detail.

In closing I will say that I still think the Abbé deceives himself and that his hope is optimistic. I accept Victor Hugo as a great poet, but I have never heard it said that he was a prophet. As to the closing words (*quant au mot de*

* For the benefit of our readers, we quote this passage from Mme. Blavatsky: “. As the white ray of light is decomposed by the prism into the various colours of the solar spectrum, so the beam of divine truth, in passing through the *three-sided* prism of man’s nature, has been broken up into vari-coloured fragments called RELIGIONS. And, as the rays of the spectrum, by imperceptible shadings, merge into each other, so the great theologies that have appeared at different degrees of divergence from the original source, have been connected by minor schisms, schools, and off-shoots from the one side or the other. Combined, their aggregate represents one eternal truth; separate, they are but shades of human error and the signs of imperfection” —Editor, *Le Lotus*.

† See Note No. 8, in a forthcoming issue.

la fin, ou de la faim) * which my interlocutor flings at me in the guise of farewell, I would have him observe: (1) that misery and dirt are found practically everywhere where the Catholic priest rules, and, (2) that there, near the Mahâtman, as he says, there are no poor for the good reason that there are no rich; other people, besides the mendacious missionaries, have been there.

And now that I have answered the Abbé Roca, the *Catholic priest*, I will terminate this unduly lengthy reply by addressing Mr. Roca, my critic and interlocutor, who is as courteous as he is spiritual when he is willing to forget his cassock. It is to the latter that I express my sincere regret that I have had to parry all his blows and to contradict him in everything and everywhere. If he thinks this reply, as well as my previous “Notes,” to be a

new “drubbing,” he will be wrong. For if we do not understand one another—though he may say *he understands me very well*—that is because, while in appearance we are both speaking the same language, our ideas as to the value and meaning of Christian esotericism, of Brâhman-Buddhist esotericism, and of that of the Gnostics, are diametrically opposed. He derives his conclusions and his esoteric data from sources which I could not know, since they are of modern invention, while I am speaking to him in the language of the ancient Initiates and offer him the conclusions of archaic esotericism which, in their turn, as far as I can see, are quite unfamiliar to him.

To define with accuracy and *without ambiguity* our respective positions, it seems to me that, while I offer an esoteric outline of the *universal* Christos, *i.e.*, of the impersonal and pre-Christian LOGOS, he answers me by falling back upon the sectarian Christ of the modern era, on the ecclesiastical and dogmatic Christ whose pattern is pre-Christian. To the esotericism of the ancient Gnosis that he declares the Church has lost, he opposes the scholastic esotericism of the Middle Ages. He tries to get even with me

* [An untranslatable expression, as it contains a pun on words. The French word “faim” means hunger. The “closing words” of the Abbé hint at misery and hunger in the Orient.—*Compiler.*]



CHARLES JOHNSTON
(1867-1931)

(Courtesy Alan Denson, London, England)
(For biographical sketch see the Bio-Bibliographical Index)

by means of the subtleties of theologians and Rosicrucians who, to escape being burned

alive, concealed themselves under a cloak of orthodoxy and openly affected a Christianity against which they protested in secret. In view of all this, how could we understand each other? As to “better appreciating each other,” I thank the Abbé for his kind wishes, while doubting whether he can ever appreciate the *smoothness of my manners* combined with the *extreme frankness of my language*; as for myself, I beg him to believe that I have always appreciated in him the able writer of large and liberal heart, as well as the fearless priest who has the rare courage of his opinions.

After all, *vera pro gratiis*, even though that saying ought to be followed by its opposite, *veritas odium parit*.

H. P. BLAVATSKY,
Corresponding-Secretary of The Theosophical Society.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

April, 1888

FOOTNOTES TO “THE TIDE OF LIFE”

[*The Path*, New York, Vol. III, Nos. 1 & 2, April and May, 1888,
pp. 2-8, and 42-48 resp.]

[Charles Johnston, the eminent Sanskritist and Orientalist (married to H.P.B.’s niece, Vera Vladimirovna de Zhelihovsky) writes an article analyzing the inner meaning of the first chapter of *Genesis*. H.P.B. appends a number of footnotes to various statements by the writer.] *

[The first thirty-four verses the most ancient The origin of this ancient tract . . . we can only guess at. . . . This tract splits off like a flake from the story of Adam and Eve . . . a few of the lines of cleavage may be shown]

The esoteric teaching accounts for it. The first chapter of *Genesis*, or the Elohist version, does not treat of the

* [Consult the comprehensive biographical sketch of Charles Johnston in the Bio-Bibliographical Index of the present Volume.— *Compiler*.]

creation of man at all. It is what the Hindu *Puranas* call the *Primal* creation, while the second chapter is the *Secondary* creation or that of our globe of man. Adam Kadmon is no *man*, but the *protologos*, the collective Sephirothal Tree—the “Heavenly Man,” the *vehicle* (or *Vahan*) used by En-Soph to manifest in the phenomenal world (see *Zohar*); and as the “male and female” Adam is the “Archetypal man,” so the *animals* mentioned in the first chapter are the *sacred* animals, or the zodiacal signs, while “Light” refers to the angels so called.

[In the more ancient cosmogony, contained in the first thirty-four verses, the account of the formation of man is similar to, and parallel with, that of the animals. “The Elohim created man, male and female.”]

“The great whale” (i, 21) is the *Makara* of the Hindu Zodiac—translated very queerly as “Capricorn,” whereas it is not even a “Crocodile,” as “Makara” is translated, but a nondescript aquatic monster, the “Leviathan” in Hebrew symbolism, and the vehicle of Vishnu. Whoever may be right in the recent polemical quarrel on *Genesis* between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Huxley, it is not *Genesis* that is guilty of the error imputed. The Elohist portion of it is charged with the great zoological blunder of placing the evolution of the birds before the reptiles (*Vide—Modern Science and Modern Thought*, by Mr. S.

Laing), and Mr. Gladstone is twitted with supporting it. But one has but to read the Hebrew text to find that verse 20 (chap. i) does speak of reptiles before the birds. And God said, "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the [*swimming and creeping*, not] moving creatures that hath life, and fowl that may fly," etc. This ought to settle the quarrel and justify *Genesis*, for here we find it in a perfect zoological order—first the evolution of grass, then of larger vegetation, then of fish (or mollusks), reptiles, birds, etc., etc. *Genesis* is a purely symbolical and kabalistic volume. It can neither be understood nor appreciated, if judged on the mistranslations and misinterpretations of its Christian remodellers.

[the second account . . . introduces the . . . creation of Adam from dust, and of Eve from Adam's rib. Besides this, earlier in the

FOOTNOTES TO "THE TIDE OF LIFE"

239

second account, we find that the formation of man as detailed in the first tract is entirely ignored by the words—"There was not a man to till the ground."]

Because Adam is the symbol of the first terrestrial MAN or Humanity.

[Similarly, we have a second and distinct account of the formation of the animal kingdom; which, moreover, comes after the Seventh day]

Genesis being an eastern work, it has to be read in its own language. It is in full agreement, when understood, with the universal cosmogony and evolution of life as given in the Secret Doctrine of the Archaic Ages. The last word of Science is far from being uttered yet. Esoteric philosophy teaches that man was the first living being to appear on earth, all the animal world coming *after* him. This will be proclaimed absurdly *unscientific*. But see in *Lucifer—The Latest Romance of Science*. *

[Form exists on an ideal plane, as a purely abstract conception; into this region, and the similar one of Number, pure mathematics have penetrated.]

It is through the power to see and use these "abstract" forms that the Adept is able to evolve before our eyes any object desired—a miracle to the Christian, a fraud for the materialist. Countless myriads of forms are in that ideal sphere, and matter exists in the astral light, or even in the atmosphere, that has passed through all forms possible for us to conceive of. All that the Adept has to do is to select the "abstract form" desired, then to hold it before him with a force and intensity unknown to the men of this hurried age, while he draws into its boundaries the matter required to make it visible. How easy this to state, how difficult to believe; yet quite true, as many a theosophist very well knows. The oftener this is done with any one

* [Reference is made here to H.P.B.'s review of a work by Paul Topinard whose actual title has not been

traced. It appeared in *Lucifer*, Vol. I, September, 1887, pp. 72-74. *Vide* Vol. VIII, pp. 33-37, of the present Series.—*Compiler.*]

form, the easier it becomes. And so it is with nature: her ease of production grows like a habit.

[. . . every geometrical form, as well as every number, has a definite, innate relation to some particular entity on the other planes, to some colour or tone, for instance; and there is good reason to believe that this holds true of all the planes, that the entities on each of them are bound to the entities on all the others by certain spiritual relations which run like threads of gold through the different planes, binding them all together in one Divine Unity.]

Here is the key so much desired by enterprising—indeed all—students. It is by means of these correlations of colour, sound, form, number, and substance—that the trained will of the Initiate rules and uses the denizens of the elemental world. Many theosophists have had slight conscious relations with elementals, but always without their will acting, and, upon trying to make elementals see, hear, or act for them, a total indifference on the part of the nature spirit is all they have got in return. These failures are due to the fact that the elemental cannot understand the thought of the person; it can only be reached when the exact scale of being to which it belongs is vibrated whether it be that of colour, form, sound, or whatever else.

[The sacred theories of the East teach that man is the result of two converging curves of evolution, the one curve ascending through the vegetable and animal kingdoms and marking the evolution of the physical body, while the other curve descends from a super-physical spiritual race, called by some the “Progenitors” or “*Pitris*,” This curve marks the downward evolution of man’s spiritual nature the development of the soul.]

There is an important point in the teachings of the Secret Doctrine which has been continually neglected. The above described evolution—the spiritual falling into the physical, or from mineral up to man, takes place only during the 1st of the two subsequent Rounds. At the beginning of the fourth “Round” in the middle of which begins the turning point upward—*i.e.*, from the physical up to the spiritual, man is said to appear before anything else on earth, the vegetation which covered the earth belonging to the 3rd Round, and being quite ethereal, transparent. The first man (Humanity) is Ethereal too, for he is but the

shadow (*Chhaya*) “in the image” of his progenitors, because he is the “astral body” or image of his *Pitri* (father). This is why in India gods are said to have no shadows. After which and from this primeval race, evolution supplies man with a “coat of skin” from the terrestrial elements and kingdom—mineral, vegetable, and animal.

[the real elements are purer and more spiritual than their representatives on the physical plane]

This is one reason for calling the objective phenomenal world an “illusion.” It is an illusion and ever impermanent because the matter of which the objects are composed continually returns to the primordial condition of matter, where it is invisible to mortal eyes. The earth, water, air, and fire that we think we see are respectively only the effects produced on our senses by the primordial matter held in either of the combinations that bring about the vibration properly belonging to those classes: the moment the combination is entirely broken, the phenomena cease and we see the objects no more.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**

April, 1888

LETTER FROM H. P. BLAVATSKY TO THE SECOND AMERICAN CONVENTION

[Originally published in the *Report of Proceedings* of the Second Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society, American Section, held at Chicago, Ill., April 22 and 23, 1888. The original manuscript of this Letter is held in the Archives of the former Point Loma Theosophical Society.]

TO WILLIAM Q. JUDGE,

General Secretary of the American Section of the Theosophical Society.

MY DEAREST BROTHER AND CO FOUNDER OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY:

In addressing to you this letter, which I request you to read to the Convention summoned for April 22nd, I must first present my hearty congratulations and most cordial

242

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

good wishes to the assembled Delegates and good Fellows of our Society, and to yourself—the heart and soul of that Body in America. We were several, to call it to life in 1875. Since then you have remained alone to preserve that life through good and evil report. It is to you chiefly, if not entirely, that the Theosophical Society owes its existence in 1888. Let me then thank you for it, for the first, and perhaps for the last, time publicly, and from the bottom of my heart, which beats only for the cause you represent so well and serve so faithfully. I ask you also to remember that, on this important occasion, my voice is but the feeble echo of other more sacred voices, and the transmitter of the approval of Those whose presence is alive in more than one true Theosophical heart, and lives, as I know, pre-eminently in yours. May the assembled Society feel the warm greeting as earnestly as it is given, and may every Fellow present, who realizes that he has deserved it, profit by the Blessings sent.

Theosophy has lately taken a new start in America which marks the commencement of a new Cycle in the affairs of the Society in the West. And the policy you are now following is admirably adapted to give scope for the widest expansion of the movement, and to establish on a firm basis an organization which, while promoting feelings of fraternal sympathy, social unity, and solidarity, will leave ample room for individual freedom and exertion in the common cause—that of helping mankind.

The multiplication of local centres should be a foremost consideration in your minds, and each man should strive to be a centre of work in himself. When his inner development has reached a certain point, he will naturally draw those with whom he is in contact under the same influence; a nucleus will be formed, round which other people will gather, forming a centre from which information and spiritual influence radiate, and towards

which higher influences are directed.

But let no man set up a popery instead of Theosophy, as this would be suicidal and has ever ended most fatally. We are all fellow-students, more or less advanced; but no one belonging to the Theosophical Society ought to count

himself as more than, at best, a pupil-teacher—one who has no right to dogmatize.

Since the Society was founded, a distinct change has come over the spirit of the age. Those who gave us commission to found the Society foresaw this, now rapidly growing, wave of transcendental influence following that other wave of mere phenomenalism. Even the journals of Spiritualism are gradually eliminating the phenomena and wonders, to replace them with philosophy. The Theosophical Society led the van of this movement; but, although Theosophical ideas have entered into every development or form which awakening spirituality has assumed, yet Theosophy pure and simple has still a severe battle to fight for recognition. The days of old are gone to return no more, and many are the Theosophists who, taught by bitter experience, have pledged themselves to make of the Society a “miracle club” no longer. The faint-hearted have asked in all ages for signs and wonders, and when these failed to be granted, they refused to believe. Such are not those who will ever comprehend Theosophy pure and simple. But there are others among us who realize intuitively that the recognition of pure Theosophy—the philosophy of the rational explanation of things and not the tenets—is of the most vital importance in the Society, inasmuch as it alone can furnish the beacon-light needed to guide humanity on its true path.

This should never be forgotten, nor should the following fact be overlooked. On the day when Theosophy will have accomplished its most holy and most important mission—namely, to unite firmly a body of men of all nations in brotherly love and bent on a pure altruistic work, not on a labour with selfish motives—on that day only will Theosophy become higher than any nominal brotherhood of man. This will be a wonder and a miracle truly, for the realization of which Humanity is vainly waiting for the last 18 centuries, and which every association has hitherto failed to accomplish.

Orthodoxy in Theosophy is a thing neither possible nor desirable. It is diversity of opinion, within certain limits, that keeps the Theosophical Society a living and a healthy

body, its many other ugly features notwithstanding. Were it not, also, for the existence of a large amount of uncertainty in the minds of students of Theosophy, such healthy divergencies would be impossible, and the Society would degenerate into a sect, in which a

narrow and stereotyped creed would take the place of the living and breathing spirit of Truth and an ever growing Knowledge.

According as people are prepared to receive it, so will new Theosophical teaching be given. But no more will be given than the world, on its present level of spirituality, can profit by. It depends on the spread of Theosophy—the assimilation of what has been already given—how much more will be revealed, and how soon.

It must be remembered that the Society was not founded as a nursery for forcing a supply of Occultists—as a factory for the manufacture of Adepts. It was intended to stem the current of materialism, and also that of spiritualistic phenomenalism and the worship of the Dead. It had to guide the spiritual awakening that has now begun, and not to pander to psychic cravings which are but another form of materialism. For by “materialism” is meant not only an anti-philosophical negation of pure spirit, and, even more, materialism in conduct and action—brutality, hypocrisy, and, above all selfishness,—but also the fruits of a disbelief in all but material things, a disbelief which has increased enormously during the last century, and which has led many, after a denial of all existence other than that in matter, into a blind belief in the *materialization of Spirit*.

The tendency of modern civilization is a reaction towards animalism, towards a development of those qualities which conduce to the success in life of man as an animal in the struggle for animal existence. Theosophy seeks to develop the human nature in man in addition to the animal, and at the sacrifice of the superfluous animality which modern life and materialistic teachings have developed to a degree which is abnormal for the human being at this stage of his progress.

Men cannot all be Occultists, but they can all be Theosophists. Many who have never heard of the Society

are Theosophists without knowing it themselves; for the essence of Theosophy is the perfect harmonizing of the divine with the human in man, the adjustment of his godlike qualities and aspirations, and their sway over the terrestrial or animal passions in him. Kindness, absence of every ill feeling or selfishness, charity, good-will to all beings, and perfect justice to others as to one's self, are its chief features. He who teaches Theosophy preaches the gospel of good-will; and the converse of this is true also,—he who preaches the gospel of good-will, teaches Theosophy.

This aspect of Theosophy has never failed to receive due and full recognition in the pages of the “PATH,” a journal of which the American Section has good reason to be proud. It is a teacher and a power; and the fact that such a periodical should be produced and supported in the United States speaks in eloquent praise both of its Editor and its readers.

America is also to be congratulated on the increase in the number of the Branches or Lodges which is now taking place. It is a sign that in things spiritual as well as things temporal the great American Republic is well fitted for independence and

self-organization. The Founders of the Society wish every Section, as soon as it becomes strong enough to govern itself, to be as independent as is compatible with its allegiance to the Society as a whole and to the Great Ideal Brotherhood, the lowest formal grade of which is represented by the Theosophical Society.

Here in England Theosophy is waking into new life. The slanders and absurd inventions of the Society for Psychical Research have almost paralyzed it, though only for a very short time, and the example of America has stirred the English Theosophists into renewed activity. *Lucifer* sounded the reveille, and the first fruit has been the founding of the "Theosophical Publication Society." This Society is of great importance. It has undertaken the very necessary work of breaking down the barrier of prejudice and ignorance which has formed so great an impediment to the spread of Theosophy. It will act as a recruiting agency for the Society by the wide distribution of elementary literature on the subject, among those who

are in any way prepared to give ear to it. The correspondence already received shows that it is creating an interest in the subject, and proves that in every large town in England there exist quite enough isolated Theosophists to form groups or Lodges under charter from the Society. But, at present, these students do not even know of each other's existence, and many of them have never heard of the Theosophical Society until now. I am thoroughly satisfied of the great utility of this new Society, composed as it is to a large extent of members of the Theosophical Society, and being under the control of prominent Theosophists, such as you, my dear Brother W.Q. Judge, Mabel Collins, and the Countess Wachtmeister.

I am confident that, when the real nature of Theosophy is understood, the prejudice against it, now so unfortunately prevalent, will die out. Theosophists are of necessity the friends of all movements in the world, whether intellectual or simply practical, for the amelioration of the conditions of mankind. We are the friends of all those who fight against drunkenness, against cruelty to animals, against injustice to women, against corruption in society or in government, although we do not meddle in politics. We are the friends of those who exercise practical charity, who seek to lift a little of the tremendous weight of misery that is crushing down the poor. But, in our quality of Theosophists, we cannot engage in any one of these great works in particular. As individuals we may do so, but as Theosophists we have a larger, more important, and much more difficult work to do. People say that Theosophists should show what is in them, that "the tree is known by its fruit." Let them build dwellings for the poor, it is said let them open "soup-kitchens," etc., etc., and the world will believe that there is something in Theosophy. These good people forget that Theosophists, as such, are poor, and that the Founders themselves are poorer than any, and that one of them, at any rate, the humble writer of these lines, has no property of her own, and has to work hard for her daily bread whenever she finds time from her Theosophical duties. The function of Theosophists is to open men's hearts and

understandings to charity, justice,

and generosity, attributes which belong specifically to the human kingdom and are natural to man when he has developed the qualities of a human being. Theosophy teaches the animal-man to be a human-man; and when people have learnt to think and feel as truly human beings should feel and think, they will act humanely, and works of charity, justice, and generosity will be done spontaneously by all.

Now with regard to *The Secret Doctrine*, the publication of which some of you urged so kindly upon me, and in such cordial terms, a while ago. I am very grateful for the hearty support promised and for the manner in which it was expressed. The MSS. of the first three volumes is now ready for the press; and its publication is only delayed by the difficulty which is experienced in finding the necessary funds. Though I have not written it with an eye to money, yet, having left Adyar, I must live and pay my way in the world so long as I remain in it. Moreover, the Theosophical Society urgently needs money for many purposes, and I feel that I should not be justified in dealing with *The Secret Doctrine* as I dealt with *Isis Unveiled*. From my former work I have received personally in all only a few hundred dollars, although nine editions have been issued. Under these circumstances I am endeavouring to find means of securing the publication of *The Secret Doctrine* on better terms this time, and here I am offered next to nothing. So, my dearest Brothers and Co-workers in the trans-Atlantic lands, you must forgive me the delay, and not blame me for it but the unfortunate conditions I am surrounded with.

I should like to revisit America, and shall perhaps do so one day, should my health permit. I have received pressing invitations to take up my abode in your great country which I love so much for its noble freedom. Colonel Olcott, too, urges upon me very strongly to return to India, where he is fighting almost single-handed the great and hard fight in the cause of Truth; but I feel that, for the present, my duty lies in England and with the Western Theosophists, where for the moment the hardest fight against prejudice and ignorance has to be fought.

But whether I be in England or in India, a large part of my heart and much of my hope for Theosophy lie with you in the United States, where the Theosophical Society was founded, and of which country I myself am proud of being a citizen. But you must remember that, although there must be local Branches of the Theosophical Society, there can be no local Theosophists; and just as you all belong to the Society, *so do I belong to you all*.

I shall leave my dear Friend and Colleague, Col. Olcott, to tell you all about the

condition of affairs in India, where everything looks favourable, as I am informed, for I have no doubt that he also will have sent his good wishes and congratulations to your Convention.

Meanwhile, my far-away and dear Brother, accept the warmest and sincerest wishes for the welfare of your Societies and of yourself personally, and, while conveying to all your colleagues the expression of my fraternal regards, assure them that, at the moment when you will be reading to them the present lines, I shall—if alive—be in Spirit, Soul, and Thought amidst you all.

Yours ever, in the truth of the GREAT CAUSE we are all working for,

[SEAL] *

H. P. BLAVATSKY. ❦

LONDON, *April 3rd, 1888.*

* [Sanskrit letters स and त् for Sat, over a winged globe.—*Compiler.*]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

May, 1888

OCCULTISM VERSUS THE OCCULT ARTS

249

OCCULTISM VERSUS THE OCCULT ARTS

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 9, May, 1888, PP. 173-181]

“I oft have heard, but ne’er believed till now,
There are who can by potent magic spells
Bend to their crooked purpose Nature’s laws.”

MILTON.

In this month’s “Correspondence” several letters testify to the strong impression produced on some minds by our last month’s article “Practical Occultism.” Such letters go far to prove and strengthen two logical conclusions.

(a) There are more well-educated and thoughtful men who believe in the existence of Occultism and Magic (the two differing vastly) than the modern materialist dreams of; and—

(b) That most of the believers (comprising many theosophists) have no definite idea of the nature of Occultism and confuse it with the Occult sciences in general, the “Black art” included.

Their representations of the powers it confers upon man, and of the means to be used to acquire them are as varied as they are fanciful. Some imagine that a master in the art, to show the way, is all that is needed to become a Zanoni. Others, that one has but to cross the Canal of Suez and go to India to bloom forth as a Roger Bacon or even a Count de St.-Germain. Many take for their ideal Margrave with his ever-renewing youth, and care little for the soul as the price paid for it. Not a few, mistaking “Witch-of-Endorism” pure and simple, for Occultism—”through the yawning Earth from Stygian gloom, call up the meagre ghost to walks of light,” and want, on the strength of this feat, to be regarded as full-blown Adepts. “Ceremonial Magic” according to the rules mockingly laid down by Éliphas Lévi, is another imagined *alter-ego* of the philosophy of the Arhats of old. In short, the prisms through which Occultism appears, to those innocent of the philosophy, are as multicoloured and varied as human fancy can make them.

250

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

Will these candidates to Wisdom and Power feel very indignant if told the plain truth?

It is not only useful, but it has now become *necessary* to disabuse most of them and before it is too late. This truth may be said in a few words: There are not in the West half-a-dozen among the fervent hundreds who call themselves “Occultists,” who have even an approximately correct ideal of the nature of the Science they seek to master. With a few exceptions, they are all on the highway to Sorcery. Let them restore some order in the chaos that reigns in their minds, before they protest against this statement. Let them first learn the true relation in which the Occult Sciences stand to Occultism, and the difference between the two, and then feel wrathful if they still think themselves right. Meanwhile, let them learn that Occultism differs from Magic and other secret Sciences as the glorious sun does from a rush-light, as the immutable and immortal Spirit of Man—the reflection of the absolute, causeless and unknowable ALL—differs from the mortal clay—the human body.

In our highly civilized West, where modern languages have been formed, and words coined, in the wake of ideas and thoughts—as happened with every tongue—the more the latter became materialized in the cold atmosphere of Western selfishness and its incessant chase after the goods of this world, the less was there any need felt for the production of new terms to express that which was tacitly regarded as absolute and exploded “superstition.” Such words could answer only to ideas which a cultured man was scarcely supposed to harbour in his mind. “Magic,” a synonym for jugglery; “Sorcery,” an equivalent for crass ignorance; and “Occultism,” the sorry relic of crack-brained, mediaeval Fire-philosophers, of the Jacob Böhmes and the Saint-Martins, are expressions believed more than amply sufficient to cover the whole field of “thimble-rigging.” They are terms of contempt, and used generally only in reference to the dross and residues of the dark ages and its preceding aeons of paganism. Therefore have we no terms in the English tongue to define and shade the difference between such abnormal powers, or the sciences that lead to the

acquisition of them, with the nicety possible in the Eastern languages—pre-eminently the Sanskrit. What do the words “miracle” and “enchantment” (words identical in meaning after all, as both express the idea of producing wonderful things by *breaking the laws of nature* (!!)) as explained by the accepted authorities) convey to the minds of those who hear, or who pronounce them? A Christian—*breaking* “of the laws of nature,” notwithstanding—while believing firmly in the *miracles*, because said to have been produced by God through Moses, will either scout the enchantments performed by Pharaoh’s magicians, or attribute them to the devil. It is the latter whom our pious enemies connect with Occultism, while their impious foes, the infidels, laugh at Moses, Magicians, and Occultists, and would blush to give one serious thought to such “superstitions.” This, because there is no term in existence to show the difference; no words to express the lights and shadows and draw the line of demarcation between the sublime and the true, the absurd and the ridiculous. The latter are the theological interpretations which teach the “breaking of the laws of Nature” by man, God, or devil; the former—the *scientific*

“miracles” and enchantments of Moses and the Magicians *in accordance with natural laws*, both having been learned in all the Wisdom of the Sanctuaries, which were the “Royal Societies” of those days—and in true **OCCULTISM**. This last word is certainly misleading, translated as it stands from the compound word *Gupta-Vidya*, “Secret Knowledge.” But the knowledge of what? Some of the Sanskrit terms may help us.

There are four (out of the many other) names of the various kinds of Esoteric Knowledge or Sciences given, even in the exoteric *Puranas* There is (1) *Yajña-Vidya*, * knowledge of the occult powers

* The *Yajña*, say the Brahmans, exists from eternity, for it proceeded forth from the Supreme One . . . in whom it lay dormant from “no beginning.” It is the key to the TRIVIDYA, the thrice sacred science contained in the Rig verses, which teaches the Yajus or sacrificial mysteries. “The Yajña exists as an invisible thing at

awakened in Nature by the performance of certain religious ceremonies and rites. (2) *Mahavidya*, the “great knowledge,” the magic of the Kabalists and of the *Tantrika* worship, often Sorcery of the worst description. (3) *Guhya-Vidya*, knowledge of the mystic powers residing in Sound (Ether), hence in the Mantras (chanted prayers or incantations) and depending on the rhythm and melody used; in other words a magical performance based on Knowledge of the Forces of Nature and their correlation; and (4) ATMA-VIDYA, a term which is translated simply “knowledge of the Soul,” *true Wisdom* by the Orientalists, but which means far more.

This last is the only kind of Occultism that any theosophist who admires *Light on the Path*, and who would be wise and unselfish, ought to strive after. All the rest is some branch of the “Occult Sciences,” *i.e.*, arts based on the knowledge of the ultimate essence of all things in the Kingdoms of Nature—such as minerals, plants and animals—hence of things pertaining to the realm of *material* nature, however invisible that essence may be, and howsoever much it has hitherto eluded the grasp of Science. Alchemy, Astrology, Occult Physiology, Chiromancy, exist in Nature and the *exact* Sciences—perhaps so called, because they are found in this age of paradoxical philosophies the reverse—have already discovered not a few of the secrets of the above *arts*. But clairvoyance, symbolised in India as the “Eye of Īiva,” called in Japan, “Infinite Vision,” is *not* Hypnotism, the illegitimate son of Mesmerism, and is not to be acquired by such arts. All the

all times, it is like the latent power of electricity in an electrifying machine, requiring only the operation of a suitable apparatus in order to be elicited. It is supposed to extend when unrolled, from the *Ahavanīya* or sacrificial fire into which all oblations are thrown, to heaven, forming thus a bridge or ladder, by means of which the sacrificer can communicate with the world of gods and spirits, and even ascend when alive to their abodes.”—Martin Haug, *The Aitareya-Brāhmanam*, Introd., pp. 73-74.

“This Yajna is again one of the forms of the Akâsa, and the mystic word calling it into existence and pronounced mentally by the initiated Priest is the *Lost Word* receiving impulse through WILLPOWER. —*Isis Unveiled*, Vol. I, p. xlv.

others may be mastered and results obtained, whether good, bad, or indifferent; but *Atma-Vidya* sets small value on them. It includes them all and may even use them occasionally, but it does so after purifying them of their dross, for beneficent purposes, and taking care to deprive them of every element of selfish motive. Let us explain: any man or woman can set himself or herself to study one or all of the above specified “Occult Arts” without any great previous preparation, and even without adopting any too restraining mode of life. One could even dispense with any lofty standard of morality. In the last case, of course, ten to one the student would blossom into a very decent kind of sorcerer, and tumble down headlong into black magic. But what can this matter? The *Voodoos* and the *Dugpas* eat, drink and are merry over hecatombs of victims of their infernal arts. And so do the amiable gentlemen vivisectionists and the *diploma-ed* “Hypnotizers” of the Faculties of Medicine; the only difference between the two classes being that the *Voodoos* and *Dugpas* are *conscious*, and the Charcot-Richet crew *unconscious*, Sorcerers. Thus, since both have to reap the fruits of their labours and achievements in the black art, the Western practitioners should not have the punishment and reputation without the profits and enjoyments they may get therefrom. For we say it again, *hypnotism* and *vivisection* as practised in such schools, are *Sorcery* pure and simple, *minus* a knowledge that the *Voodoos* and *Dugpas* enjoy, and which no Charcot-Richet can procure for himself in fifty years of hard study and experimental observation. Let then those who will dabble in magic, whether they understand its nature or not, but who find the rules imposed upon students too hard, and who, therefore, lay *Atma-Vidya* or Occultism aside—go without it. Let them become magicians by all means, even though they do become *Voodoos* and *Dugpas* for the next ten incarnations.

But the interest of our readers will probably centre on those who are invincibly attracted towards the “Occult,” yet who neither realise the true nature of what they aspire towards, nor have they become passion-proof, far less truly unselfish.

How about these unfortunates, we shall be asked, who are thus rent in twain by conflicting forces? For it has been said too often to need repetition, and the fact itself is patent to any observer, that when once the desire for Occultism has really awakened in a man’s heart, there remains for him no hope of peace, no place of rest and comfort in all the

world. He is driven out into wild and desolate spaces of life by an ever-gnawing unrest he cannot quell. His heart is too full of passion and selfish desire to permit him to pass the Golden Gate; he cannot find rest or peace in ordinary life. Must he then inevitably fall into sorcery and black magic, and through many incarnations heap up for himself a terrible Karma? Is there no other road for him?

Indeed there is, we answer. Let him aspire to no higher than he feels able to accomplish. Let him not take a burden upon himself too heavy for him to carry. Without ever becoming a “Mahatma,” a Buddha or a Great Saint, let him study the philosophy and the “Science of Soul,” and he can become one of the modest benefactors of humanity, without any “superhuman” powers. *Siddhis* (or the Arhat powers) are only for those who are able to “lead the life,” to comply with the terrible sacrifices required for such a training, and to comply with them *to the very letter*. Let them know at once and remember always, that *true Occultism or Theosophy* is the “Great Renunciation of SELF,” unconditionally and absolutely, in thought as in action. It is ALTRUISM, and it throws him who practises it out of calculation of the ranks of the living altogether. “Not for himself, but for the world, he lives,” as soon as he has pledged himself to the work. Much is forgiven during the first years of probation. But, no sooner is he “accepted” than his personality must disappear, and he has to become *a mere beneficent force in Nature*. There are two poles for him after that, two paths, and no midway place of rest. He has either to ascend laboriously, step by step, often through numerous incarnations and *no Devachanic break*, the golden ladder leading to Mahatmaship (the *Arhat* or *Bodhisattva* condition), or—he will let himself slide down the ladder at the first false step, and roll down into *Dugpaship*. . . .

All this is either unknown or left out of sight altogether. Indeed, one who is able to follow the silent evolution of the preliminary aspirations of the candidates, often finds strange ideas quietly taking possession of their minds. There are those whose reasoning powers have been so distorted by foreign influences that they imagine that animal passions can be so sublimated and elevated that their fury, force, and fire can, so to speak, be turned inwards; that they can be stored and shut up in one’s breast, until their energy is, not expanded, but turned toward higher and more holy purposes: namely, *until their collective and unexpanded strength enables their possessor to enter the true Sanctuary of the Soul* and stand therein in the presence of the *Master*—the HIGHER SELF! For this purpose they will not struggle with their passions nor slay them. They will simply, by a strong effort of will put down the fierce flames and keep them at bay within their natures, allowing the fire to smoulder under a thin layer of ashes. They submit joyfully to the torture of the Spartan boy who allowed the fox to devour his entrails rather than part with it. Oh, poor blind visionaries!

As well hope that a band of drunken chimney-sweeps, hot and greasy from their work, may be shut up in a Sanctuary hung with pure white linen, and that instead of soiling and turning it by their presence into a heap of dirty shreds, they will become masters in and of

the sacred recess, and finally emerge from it as immaculate as that recess. Why not imagine that a dozen of skunks imprisoned in the pure atmosphere of a *Dgon-pa* (a monastery) can issue out of it impregnated with all the perfumes of the incenses used? Strange aberration of the human mind. Can it be so? Let us argue.

The “Master” in the Sanctuary of our souls is “the Higher Self”—the divine spirit whose consciousness is based upon and derived solely (at any rate during the mortal life of the man in whom it is captive) from the Mind, which we have agreed to call the *Human Soul* (the “Spiritual Soul” being the vehicle of the Spirit). In its turn the former (the *personal* or human soul) is a compound in its highest form, of spiritual aspirations, volitions, and

divine love; and in its lower aspect, of animal desires and terrestrial passions imparted to it by its associations with its vehicle, the seat of all these. It thus stands as a link and a medium between the animal nature of man which its higher reason seeks to subdue, and his divine spiritual nature to which it gravitates, whenever it has the upper hand in its struggle with the *inner animal*. The latter is the instinctual “animal Soul” and is the hotbed of those passions, which, as just shown, are lulled instead of being killed, and locked up in their breasts by some imprudent enthusiasts. Do they still hope to turn thereby the muddy stream of the animal sewer into the crystalline waters of life? And where, on what neutral ground can they be imprisoned so as not to affect man? The fierce passions of love and lust are still alive and they are allowed to still remain in the place of their birth—*that same animal soul*; for both the higher and the lower portions of the “Human Soul” or Mind reject such inmates, though they cannot avoid being tainted with them as neighbours. The “Higher Self” or Spirit is as unable to assimilate such feelings as water to get mixed with oil or unclean liquid tallow. It is thus the mind alone, the sole link and medium between the man of earth and the Higher Self—that is the only sufferer, and which is in the incessant danger of being dragged down by those passions that may be re-awakened at any moment, and perish in the abyss of matter. And how can it ever attune itself to the divine harmony of the highest Principle, when that harmony is destroyed by the mere presence, within the Sanctuary in preparation, of such animal passions? How can harmony prevail and conquer, when the soul is stained and distracted with the turmoil of passions and the terrestrial desires of the bodily senses, or even of the “Astral man”?

For this “Astral”—the shadowy “double” (in the animal as in man) is not the companion of the *divine Ego* but of the *earthly body*. It is the link between the personal SELF, the lower consciousness of *Manas* and the Body, and is the vehicle of *transitory, not of immortal life*. Like the shadow projected by man, it follows his movements and impulses slavishly and mechanically, and leans therefore to

matter without ever ascending to Spirit. It is only when the power of the passions is dead altogether, and when they have been crushed and annihilated in the retort of an unflinching will; when not only all the lusts and longings of the flesh are dead, but also the recognition of the personal Self is killed out and the “astral” has been reduced in consequence to a cipher, that the Union with the “Higher Self” can take place. Then when the “Astral” reflects only the conquered man, the still living but no more the longing, selfish personality, then the brilliant *Augoeides*, the divine SELF, can vibrate in conscious harmony with both the poles of the human Entity—the man of matter purified, and the ever pure Spiritual Soul—and stand in the presence of the MASTER SELF, the Christos of the mystic Gnostic, blended, merged into, and one with IT for ever.*

How then can it be thought possible for a man to enter the “straight gate” of occultism when his daily and hourly thoughts are bound up with worldly things, desires of possession and power, with lust, ambition and duties, which, however honourable, are still of the earth earthy? Even the love for wife and family—the purest as the most unselfish of human affections—is a barrier to *real* occultism. For whether we take as an example the holy love of a mother for her child, or that of a husband for his wife, even in these feelings, when analyzed to the very bottom, and thoroughly sifted, there is still *selfishness* in the first, and an *égoïsme à deux* in the second instance. What mother would not sacrifice without a moment’s hesitation hundreds and thousands of lives for that of the child of her heart? and what lover or true husband would not break the happiness of every other man and woman around him to

* Those who would feel inclined to see three *Egos* in one man will show themselves unable to perceive the metaphysical meaning. Man is a trinity composed of Body, Soul and Spirit; but *man* is nevertheless *one* and is surely not his body. It is the latter which is the property, the transitory clothing of the man. The three “Egos” are MAN in his three aspects on the astral, intellectual or psychic, and the Spiritual planes, or states.

satisfy the desire of one whom he loves? This is but natural, we shall be told. Quite so; in the light of the code of human affections; less so, in that of divine universal love. For, while the heart is full of thoughts for a little group of *selves*, near and dear to us, how shall the rest of mankind fare in our souls? What percentage of love and care will there remain to bestow on the “great orphan”? And how shall the “still small voice” make itself heard in a soul entirely occupied with its own privileged tenants? What room is there left for the needs of Humanity *en bloc* to impress themselves upon, or even receive a speedy response? And yet, he who would profit by the wisdom of the universal mind, has to reach it through *the whole of Humanity* without distinction of race, complexion, religion or

social status. It is *altruism*, not *ego-ism* even in its most legal and noble conception, that can lead the unit to merge its little Self in the Universal Selves. It is to *these* needs and to this work that the true disciple of true Occultism has to devote himself, if he would obtain Theosophy, divine Wisdom and Knowledge.

The aspirant has to choose absolutely between the life of the world and the life of Occultism. It is useless and vain to endeavour to unite the two, for no one can serve two masters and satisfy both. No one can serve his body and the higher Soul, and do his family duty and his universal duty, without depriving either one or the other of its rights; for he will either lend his ear to the “still small voice” and fail to hear the cries of his little ones, or, he will listen but to the wants of the latter and remain deaf to the voice of Humanity. It would be a ceaseless, a maddening struggle for almost any married man, who would pursue true practical Occultism, instead of its *theoretical* philosophy. For he would find himself ever hesitating between the voice of the impersonal divine love of Humanity, and that of the personal, terrestrial love. And this could only lead him to fail in one or the other, or perhaps in both his duties. Worse than this. For, *whoever indulges after having pledged himself to OCCULTISM in the gratification of a terrestrial love or lust*, must feel an almost immediate result; that of being irresistibly dragged from the impersonal divine state

OCCULTISM VERSUS THE OCCULT ARTS

259

down to the lower plane of matter. Sensual, or even mental self-gratification, involves the immediate loss of the powers of spiritual discernment; the voice of the MASTER can no longer be distinguished from that of one’s passions *or even that of a Dugpa*; the right from wrong; sound morality from mere casuistry. The Dead Sea fruit assumes the most glorious mystic appearance, only to turn to ashes on the lips, and to gall in the heart resulting in:—

“Depth ever deepening, darkness darkening still;
Folly for wisdom, guilt for innocence;
Anguish for rapture, and for hope despair.”

And once being mistaken and having acted on their mistakes, most men shrink from realising their error, and thus descend deeper and deeper into the mire. And, although it is the intention that decides primarily whether *white* or *black* magic is exercised, yet the results even of involuntary, unconscious sorcery cannot fail to be productive of bad Karma. Enough has been said to show that *sorcery is any kind of evil influence exercised upon other persons, who suffer, or make other persons suffer, in consequence*. Karma is a heavy stone splashed in the quiet waters of Life; and it must produce ever widening circles of ripples, carried wider and wider, almost *ad infinitum*. Such causes produced have to call forth effects, and these are evidenced in the just laws of Retribution.

Much of this may be avoided if people will only abstain from rushing into practices neither the nature nor importance of which they understand. No one is expected to carry a burden beyond his strength and powers. There are “natural-born magicians”; Mystics and Occultists by birth, and by right of direct inheritance from a series of incarnations and

aeons of suffering and failures. These are passion-proof, so to say. No fires of earthly origin can fan into a flame any of their senses or desires; no human voice can find response in their souls, except the great cry of Humanity. These only may be certain of

success. But they can be met only far and wide, and they pass through the narrow gates of Occultism because they carry no personal luggage of human transitory sentiments along with them. They have got rid of the feeling of the lower personality, paralyzed thereby the “astral” animal, and the golden, but narrow gate is thrown open before them. Not so with those who have to carry yet for several incarnations the burden of sins committed in previous lives, and even in their present existence. For such, unless they proceed with great caution, the golden gate of Wisdom may get transformed into the wide gate and the broad way “that leadeth unto destruction,” and therefore “many be they that enter in thereby.” This is the Gate of the Occult arts, practised for selfish motives and in the absence of the restraining and beneficent influence of ATMA-VIDYA. We are in the Kali Yuga and its fatal influence is a thousand-fold more powerful in the West than it is in the East; hence the easy preys made by the Powers of the Age of Darkness in this cyclic struggle, and the many delusions under which the world is now labouring. One of these is the relative facility with which men fancy they can get at the “Gate” and cross the threshold of Occultism without any great sacrifice. It is the dream of most Theosophists, one inspired by desire for Power and personal selfishness, and it is not such feelings that can ever lead them to the coveted goal. For, as well said by one believed to have sacrificed himself for Humanity—“narrow is the gate and straight the way that leadeth unto life” eternal, and therefore “few be they that find it.” So straight indeed, that at the bare mention of some of the preliminary difficulties the affrighted Western candidates turn back and retreat with a shudder.

Let them stop here and attempt no more in their great weakness. For if, while turning their backs on the narrow gate, they are dragged by their desire for the Occult one step in the direction of the broad and more inviting Gates of that golden mystery which glitters in the light of illusion, woe to them! It can lead only to Dugpa-ship, and they will be sure to find themselves very soon landed on that

Via Fatale of the *Inferno*, over whose portal Dante read the words:

*“Per me si va nella città dolente,
Per me si va nell’eterno dolore,*

Per me si va tra la perduta gente. . . .”

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

May, 1888

FOOTNOTES TO “THE @RADDHA”

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, May, June, July, August, 1888,
pp. 185-93, 296-302, 403-407, 435-441, respectively]

[Andrew T. Sibbald contributes to the pages of *Lucifer* a lengthy and scholarly essay on the origin and significance of the ancient ceremony of the @raddha. H. P. B. appended the following footnotes to various portions of the text:]

“@raddha” is a Brahmanical rite, of which there are several kinds. Gautama describes seven kinds of each of the three sorts of @raddha, generally translated as “devotional rites” to the *manes* of one’s progenitors. Manu speaks of four varieties—the offering of food to the Vi□vadhara (gods, collectively, *mystic* deities), to spirits, to departed ancestors and to guests (iii, 86). But Gautama specifies them as offerings to progenitors, on certain eight days of the fortnight, at the full and change of the moon, to @raddhas generally, and to the *manes* on the full moon of four different months. It is a very occult rite involving various mystic results.

[the friction of the branches of trees] The *Svastika*, by means of which *celestial* fire was obtained. A stick used for this purpose and called *matha* and *pramatha* (suggestive of Prometheus, indeed!) from the prefix *pra* giving the idea of *forcing* the fire to descend, added to that contained in the verb *mathami*—“to produce by friction.” The oldest rite in India, much speculated upon, but very little understood.

[every Brahmin commences by drawing the figure of a cross] Spirit and Matter, also the symbols of the male and female lines, or the vertical and the horizontal.

* [*Divina Commedia*, Canto III, 1, Inferno.]

[flesh of the long-eared white goat] Now animals are not often sacrificed in India; only occasionally the goat, to *Kali*, the blood-thirsty consort of @iva—and in a very few temples.

[the Pitris are applied to as *intercessors*. . . . As fire was worshipped as their messenger, so was the moon as their abode] This has a very occult meaning, however. There are seven classes of Pitris enumerated in the *Purânas*—but only three classes are composed of the progenitors (from *pitar*, father) of primeval man; one class creates the form of man—nay, is, or rather becomes, that form (or physical man) itself; the other two

are the creators of our souls and minds. It is a very complicated tenet—but the Pitris are surely not the “Spirits” of the dead, as believed by some spiritualists.

[twelve species of @raddha] Manu speaks of four only, and Gautama of seven. Twelve species are enumerated only in *Nirnaya Sindhu*, by Kamalakara (see *Asiat. Researches*, Vol. VII, 232), a work on religious ceremonies. But all these are exoteric and later rites.

[how could the notion of sustaining the gods by sacrifice have ever arisen?] Because esoteric teaching maintains that the Pitris are the “primeval human race, the fathers and progenitors of later men, who developed into the present physical man.”

[. . . the distinction between gods and ancestors had been lost] It was lost indeed, and long before the day of Gautama Buddha, who tried to restore Brahmanism to its original purity but—failed, and had to separate the two religious systems. The “Pitris” is a generic and collective name, and man has other progenitors more exalted and spiritual. Manu says (Chap. iii, 284), “The *wise* [the Initiated Adepts] call our fathers Vasus, our paternal grandfathers, Rudras; our paternal great grandfathers, Adityas; agreeably to a text of the Vedas,” these three classes have a direct reference in Esotericism (*a*) to the creators of man in his three chief aspects (or principles), and (*b*) to the three primeval and serial races of men who preceded the first physical and perfect Race, which the Eastern Occultists call the Atlanteans.

[the @raddha is attributed to several personages, but especially to Pururavas, son of Buddha, chief of the Lunar Line, a line marked throughout by religious innovation, and presenting, if not the fleshly body, at least the “ferver” of Buddhism] This is a mistake on the part of the author. The name of the Son of Soma (the moon) by Târâ, Brihaspati’s wife whose infidelity led to the war of the Gods with the Asuras—is Budha (Intelligence) with one *d*, not Buddha, the Enlightened.

The Buddhists have never had among their religious beliefs that of “Ferver,” if this word is meant by “Ferver.” It is a term, meaning the double, or copy body, a *Sosia*, and belongs to the Zoroastrian religion.

[Ekkodishto] *Ekoddishtha*, is a Sanskrit word—with one k, and two d’s.

[The great annual oblation is called Sapindana . . . if we write the word Sab-i-dana, we have, in Turkish, “the master and the cow.”] This might be so, if the word “Sapindana” had not been a mistake of Wilson’s, who made many, and of other scholars. In the original Sanskrit MSS. the term used is *Sapindikarana*. See *Vishnu-Purâna*. Wilson’s translation, edited and *corrected* by Fitzedward Hall. (Vol. III, p. 154.) Curious etymology. What can the “master and cow” or Sab-i-dana in Turkish, which is no ancient tongue, have to do with the Sanskrit *SapiŚīkarana*?

[the triangle . . . was one of the forms of the earth-elevation or altar constructed for that purpose. It was a square in ordinary cases; but for a person recently deceased, and apparently during the season of mourning, *it was a triangle*] All this is occult, and has an esoteric meaning. The triangle (or symbol of the three higher principles) is all that remains

of the mortal septenary, whose *quaternary* remains behind him. Every theosophist knows this.

[the Cross] The Cross was, from the highest antiquity, a spiritual, a psychic, and a phallic symbol, meta-physical, astronomical, numerical and occult. (*Vide* Mr. Gerald Massey's *The Natural Genesis*, Vol. I, pp. 422 *et seq.*)

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

May, 1888

264

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

[The vessel used in sacrifice by the Hindus is called Arghya Natha] Argha or Arghya, “libation” and “sacrificial cup”; Natha, “lord.”

THE CRUCIFIXION OF MAN

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 9, May, 1888, pp. 243-250]

“Prometheus is the impersonated representative of Idea, or of the same power as Jove, but contemplated as independent, and not immersed in the product,—as law minus the productive energy.”

—S. T. COLERIDGE.

“In abstracten wie im concreten Monismus ist es Gott selbst, der als absolutes Subject in den eingeschränkten Subjecten das Weltleid trägt, wobei er sich dann auf den Satz berufen kann: Volenti non fit injuria.”

—VON HARTMANN.

“I know that I hung on a wind-rocked tree, nine whole nights with a spear wounded, and to Odin offered,—myself to myself,—on that tree of which no one knows from what root it springs.”

—Odin’s Rune-Song, *Edda*. *

Like Odin, the High One, I, Man—
Am offered up on the tree—
Sacrificed—
Myself to Myself,
An Ideal to Myself that Ideal,
And there hang I yet, windswept
in the forest of Time;
And shall hang long aeons
in agony—
Sorrow unspeakable!

Like Prometheus
Chained to the rock,
Sun-pierced on Kavkas,
The Vulture feeds on my heart,
Myself gnawing myself
With sorrow unspeakable.

THE CRUCIFIXION OF MAN

265

I am Jesus the gentle and lowly
Hanging high on Calvary hill,
Pierced by the spear and the thorn,
Pierced in the heart and the brain,
For three long days—three nights—
three aeons
In sorrow unspeakable.

And Odin gazing sun-like
O'er earth and o'er sea
Said
“it will pass”:
and
Prometheus shrieked to the Vulture
“Ai! Ai! lo! I am free,
What art thou?
The evil Gods they shall pass
With their deeds,
And with Zeus the tyrant
be hurled down the Abyss,
Stricken by Fate
Master of Gods and of Men.
“Ai! Ai!”

And Jesus the last and the best
said
“Forgive them, they know not their deeds,
“Lo! Knowledge shall come and
“The Comforter.”

But all three are one,
I myself offered a sacrifice even to myself
Mystery unspeakable;
Ah! when shall the end come!
Ah, When?

And the Spirit—the Comforter
said

“True! all these three are one
But I, God, am that One;
I bear the World—Sorrow—
Self conscious in it,
Woe is me!
Suffering until the end
When the World shall return
Whence it came—
down the abyss,

266

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

And I shall be all in all,
And ye in me

Where Time and Space are not,
but
Where Love is.”

Lucerne, 1 885.

A.J. C.

Prometheus, the grandest “Idea” in Grecian Mythology, represents the “Nous Agonistes”—the divine part of the human soul— that fire-spark brought down by Prometheus from Heaven—and breathed into man—individualized in Man, which slowly—gradually —but surely, through and by means of agonizing conflicts with the lower Titanic earth nature, raises itself out of the lower material world into the ideal—invisible. The lower nature is represented by the tyrannic—arbitrary Zeus, the “Nomos” or law of the phenomenal world perceived by the senses (*Jupiter est quodcunque vides*). Prometheus, the New or re-born Soul, baptized in fire=spirit, is that which is the opposite of Zeus—the invisible—the unseen—the noumenal—working in the ideal world, the delights of which it is not given to the mere animal human mind to conceive.

This Promethean soul of man come down from heaven can only be freed from the earth-chains and the Time-Vulture by the destruction of Zeus (that is, his transformation—transfiguration into the higher form), the phenomenal world, and by its elevation to a higher power, that of the ideal, the only real.

Prometheus is moreover the revolt of the enlightened Soul against all false—popular—sacerdotal—established—hierarchical forms of religion, those religions which seek for personal salvation, founded on egoism, instead of general universal good and the salvation of all sentient beings.

Prometheus is the Grecian form of the Atman of the Vedanta— the true ego, set free from incarnations in the masks (personae) of personality and the torture wheel of Necessity and Fate, and admitted into its rest and home in the universal—immanent Cosmic Spirit, escaped from the sorrows of the world of Creation. Prometheus is the ideal “Nomos” or Law in the soul itself, the “Conscious law—the King of Kings,” the God

“seated in the heaven of the heart.”

In the Agonies of this “*Nous Agonistes*”—the birth agonies of the race and of each individual there must ever be that Crucifixion of the ideal man represented by Odin—Prometheus—Christ; but after the Cross comes the transfiguration, in which these words of Prometheus are fulfilled,

“By myriad pangs and woes
Bound down, *thus* shall I ’scape these bonds.”

THE CRUCIFIXION OF MAN

267

Schelling (1st Vol., p. 81) has a fine passage as to the myths of Prometheus and Pandora.

“Here [the myth of Pandora] the aspirations of Mankind for higher things are represented as the actual cause of human misery. In the words of Hesiod, ‘Epimetheus, befooled by the charms of Pandora, accepted her destructive gifts—gifts of the Immortals—and thereby brought misery and destruction to the human race.’ And Prometheus, who desired to raise the race, formed by himself to a resemblance to the Gods, suffers, chained to the rock, all the sufferings of man since he cherished in his bosom the desire of a higher freedom and knowledge. Here, on his rock, he represents, in his own person, the whole human race. The Vulture who gnaws his liver, which ever grows again, is an image of that eternal uneasiness and restless desire for higher things, which so tortures all mortals.” *

In the account of the Crucifixion of Jesus, he is represented as receiving five wounds; may not these wounds have an esoteric-symbolical meaning? Man’s senses by which he perceives the phenomenal world are five, and may not these wounds on the cross ending in the death of the person (mask of the higher man), signify the death of all low, earthly desires having their origin in these five senses, and the consequent coming to life in a purer and higher sphere now totally inconceivable to us, all our concepts being derived from those earth senses? Nailing the feet takes away the power of moving towards any object of earth desire, as that of the hands, the organs of acquisition—now, too, generally of greed—deprives us of the power of seizing the objects of our acquisitiveness; the wound in the side kills the heart, that is all the desires of earth, and wakens us into the Nirvâna of Buddhism.

The cross itself, to which the whole man was attached, is a well-known phallic emblem, representing the strongest form of human-earth sensuality; and that is a very symbol on which to crucify the man to death. (*Vide* Editors’ Note 1, at the end of this article.)

It is remarkable that in this legend Prometheus is represented as crowned with the Agnus-Castus plant (*Iugos*), the leaves of which formed the Crown of the Victors in the “*Agonia*” of the Olympic games; Christ in his Victorious Agony was crowned with the thorny *akanthus*. This Agnus-Castus plant was used also in the fête of the Thesmophoria, in honour of Demeter—the law—“*nomos*”—bringer, whose priestesses slept on its leaves as encouraging chaste desires. In Christian times this custom survived among Nuns, who used to drink a water distilled from its leaves, and Monks used knives with handles made of its wood with the same intention of encouraging chastity.

* [Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 84-89; *Theogony*, 510-14.—*Compiler*.]

Chaucer, in his beautiful poem, “The Flower and the Leaf,” makes the Queen of the ladies of the leaf—those consecrated to spiritual love—carry branches of Agnus-Castus in her hand, and singing:

“Suse le foyle, devers moi—
Mon joly cuer est endormy.”
Her heart was asleep to earth, but entranced in Heaven.*

If it should be thought impious to attribute the expression of sorrow to the divine Being, it may be remarked that the Kabbala records an old tradition relating to the Schechinah (the female—mother—brooding element in God) in which she utters the following complaint for the evil in the world, and for the separation of the primal united dual elements in humanity.

“Woe to me, I have driven away my children, and woe unto the children that they have been driven from the table of their Father!”

—See *Sympneumata* [L. Oliphant, p. 72].

And did not Jesus, the Christ—the divine Man—an incarnation of the Spirit and type of the next phase of human evolution, cry out in the bitterness of his agony, “Father, why hast thou forsaken me?” (*Vide* Editors’ Notes that follow, Note 2.)

Inspired Mr. John Pulsford, in his work *Morgenröthe*, which contains so many intimations of the new epoch of the coming Golden Age, says:

* [Considerable uncertainty exists with regard to these two lines in old French. The poem from which they are taken is of doubtful authorship, some scholars refusing to ascribe it to Chaucer. The subject of this poem is a tourney between the Knights of the Flower and the Knights of the Leaf. In the opinion of Clifford Bax (*The Distaff Muse*, London: Hollis & Carter Ltd., 1949), its approximate date would be 1450, while Chaucer died in 1400. Even the actual wording varies in the excerpt he quotes, lines 176-179 of the poem being as follows:

And she began a roundel lustily,
That *Sus le foyl de vert moy men call,*
Seen, et mon joly cuer endormi;
And then the company answered all

The meaning of the italicized sentence is not at all clear. It is impossible to say where the version of these lines as they appear in the text was taken from, nor whether the line of English which immediately follows the French is part of the poem.—*Compiler.*]

“God having clothed Himself with the sorrows of creation, it must come to pass that the whole Creation shall be filled, and clothed, with His glory. None of the present anomalies of the Creation will survive under His glory. It is not enough to say that He suffers with us; we are taught rather to say that ‘we suffer with Him,’ * assigning to Him the lion’s share of the afflictions of His creatures. He is suffering at any rate, so long as any creature suffers. To bear the sufferings of all that suffer, is a Love-necessity with Him. . . . He cannot deliver Himself from bearing griefs and carrying sorrows, so long as there are any to be borne or

carried by His sons and daughters. The First Cause must be present in all effects; not as one looking on, but as One within, bearing all.”†

“The vanity, strife and misery of disordered nature have long afflicted us; but the glory of God’s perfect Goodness is about to be revealed in the new order of man, and of nature.”‡

“Like Prometheus bound to a rock the impersonal Spirit is chained to a personality until the consciousness of his Herculean power awakes in him, and bursting his chain, he becomes again free.” §

“Der aetherische Hauch der Götter, der Funk des Prometheus ist, nach den ältesten Mythen, Princip des hhern Lebens im Menschen.” ||

That is:—

“The ethereal breath of the Gods—the Promethean fire spark is, according to the most ancient myths, the principle of the higher life in men.”

* And why “He” and not IT? Has Deity a sex? Most extraordinary custom even in monotheists—Conceit of Men, who mirror their male element in their Deity when they do not degrade the Unknown to the ridiculous and the absurd by seeking to address and speak of it as “Woman” in some cases, as “male-female,” or “Father-Mother,” in others, thus making of an impersonal absolute PRINCIPLE—a huge HERMAPHRODITE!—H.P.B.

† *Morgenröthe*, p. 110 [p. 83 in ed. of 1881].

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 111 [p. 84 in ed. of 1881].

§ Dr. Franz Hartmann, *Magic: White and Black*.

|| Schelling, Vol. I, p. 78.

EDITORS’ NOTES

1. This is one of the many semi-esoteric or mystical interpretations of *the symbolical and allegorical drama*, which has been grafted and grown upon Christendom in its dead letter sense only—the “dead letter that killeth.”

One of the *seven esoteric meanings* implied in the mystery of Crucifixion by the mystic inventors of the system—the original elaboration and adoption of which dates back into the night of time and the establishment of the MYSTERIES—is discovered in the geometrical symbols containing the history of the evolution of man. The Hebrews, whose prophet Moses was learned in the Wisdom of Egypt, and who adopted their numerical system from the Phoenicians, and later from the Gentiles from whom they borrowed most of their Kabalistic Mysticism, adapted most ingeniously the Cosmic and anthropological symbols of the “heathen” nations to their peculiar *secret* records. If Christian sacerdotalism has lost the key of it today, the early compilers of the Christian Mysteries were well versed

in Esoteric philosophy, and used it dexterously. Thus they took the word *aish* (one of the Hebrew word-forms for MAN) and used it in conjunction with that of *Shânâh*, “lunar year,” so mystically connected with the name of Jehovah, the supposed “father” of Jesus, and embosomed the mystic idea in an astronomical value and formula.

The original idea of “Man Crucified” in Space belongs certainly to the ancient Hindus, and E. Moor shows it in his *The Hindoo Pantheon* in the engraving that represents Wittoba—a form of Vishnu. Plato adopted it in his decussated Cross in Space, the X, “the second God who impressed himself on the universe in the form of the cross”; Krishna is likewise shown “crucified.” (See Dr. J. P. Lundy’s *Monumental Christianity*, pp. 173-74, fig. 72.) * Again it is repeated in the Old Testament in the queer

* [A reproduction of the Wittoba engraving in Edward Moor’s work will be found on page 296 of Volume VII of the present Series. —*Compiler.*]

injunction of *crucifying men* before the Lord, *the Sun*—which is no prophecy at all, but has a direct phallic significance. Says the most suggestive work on the Kabalistic meanings now extant—*Key to the Hebrew-Egyptian Mystery in the Source of Measures*:

In symbol, the nails of the cross have for the shape of the heads thereof a solid pyramid, and a tapering square obeliscal shaft, or phallic emblem, for the nail. Taking the position of the *three* nails in the man’s extremities, and on the cross they form or mark a *triangle* in shape, one nail being at each corner of the triangle. The wounds, or *stigmata*, in the extremities are necessarily *four*, designative of the *square*. . . . The three nails with the three wounds are in number 6, which denotes the 6 faces of the cube *unfolded* [which make the cross or man-form, or 7, counting three horizontal and four vertical bars], on which the man is placed; and this in turn points to the circular measure transferred onto the edges of the cube. The *one* wound of the feet separates into *two* when the feet are separated, making *three* together *for all*, and *four* when *separated*, or 7 in all—another and *most holy* [and *with the Jews*] *feminine* base number. *

Thus, while the phallic or sexual meaning of the “Crucifixion Nails” is proven by the geometrical and numerical reading, its mystical meaning is indicated by the short remarks upon it, as given above in its connection with, and bearing upon, Prometheus. He is another victim, for he is crucified on the Cross of Love, on the rock of human passions, a sacrifice to his devotion to the cause of the spiritual element in Humanity.

2. The now dogmatically accepted words, so dramatic for being uttered at the crucial hour, are of a later date than generally supposed. Verse 46 in-the xxviii chapter of Matthew stands now distorted by the unscrupulous editors of the Greek texts of the Evangel. *Eli, Eli, Lama Sabachthani*—*never* meant “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” but meant, indeed, originally, the reverse. They are the Sacramental words used at the final initiation in old Egypt, as elsewhere, during the Mystery of the *putting to death of Chrêstos in the mortal body with its animal passions*, and the resurrection of the Spiritual

* [Chap. II, Sect. ii, para. 21, p. 52.]

Man as an enlightened Christos in a frame now purified (the “*second* birth” of Paul, the “twice-born” or the Initiates of the Brahmans, etc., etc.). These words were addressed to the Initiate’s “Higher Self,” the Divine Spirit in him (let it be called Christ, Buddha, Chrishna, or by whatever name), at the moment when the rays of the morning Sun poured forth on the entranced body of the candidate and were supposed to recall him to life, or his *new rebirth*. They were addressed to the Spiritual Sun *within*, not to a Sun *without*, and ought to read, had they not been distorted for dogmatic purposes:

“MY GOD, MY GOD, HOW THOU DOST GLORIFY ME!”

This is well proven now in the work above quoted. Says the author:—

. Of course, our versions are taken from the original *Greek* manuscripts (the reason why we have no original Hebrew manuscripts concerning these occurrences being because the enigmas in Hebrew would betray themselves on comparison with the sources of their derivation, the Old Testament). The Greek manuscripts, without exception, give these words as—

z/8\ z/8\ 8":□ F"\$"P2"<\

They are *Hebrew words*, rendered into the *Greek*, and in Hebrew are as follows:

>*1<;(": %/- *-! *-!*

The Scripture of these words says, “that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” as their proper translation. Here then are the words, beyond all dispute; and beyond all question, such is the interpretation given of them by Scripture. Now the words will not bear this interpretation, and it is a false rendering. The true meaning is *just the opposite of the one given*, and is—

My God, my God, how thou dost glorify me!

But even more, for while *lama is why*, or *how*, as a verbal it connects the idea of *to dazzle*, or adverbially, it could run “*how dazzlingly*,”

* [The last word of this sentence, reading from right to left, namely, *shâbahhthani*, was misspelled in *Lucifer*, giving rise to confusion. H. P. B. herself drew attention to this in the next issue of her journal (Vol. II, No. 10, June, 1888, p. 295). This misspelling has been corrected in the present text.—*Compiler*.]



THOTH AND HORUS PURIFYING THE KING

From Kôm-Ombô, Egypt.

The streams are interlaced and pictured as small ansated crosses; this scene is of a similar type, but not identical With, the one mentioned by H.P.B. as being in the Temple of Philae. No reproduction of that could be found.

THE CRUCIFIXION OF MAN

273

and so on. To the unwearied reader this interpretation is enforced and made to answer, as it were, to the fulfillment of a prophetic utterance, by a marginal reference to the *first* verse of the *twenty-second* Psalm, which reads:

“My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”

The Hebrew of this verse for these words is— :

>*1<;"&7 %/- *-! *-!

as to which the reference is correct, and the interpretation sound and good, *but with an utterly different word*. The words are—

Eli, Eli, lamah azabvtha-ni?

No wit of man, however scholarly, can save this passage from *falseness of rendering* on its face; and as so, it becomes a most terrible blow upon the proper first-face sacredness of the recital.*

But no blow is strong enough to kill out the viper of *blind* faith, cowardly reverence for

established beliefs and custom, and that selfish, conceited element in civilized man which makes him prefer *a lie* that is his own to a universal truth, the common property of all—the *inferior races* of the “heathen” included.

Let the reader who doubts the statement consult the Hebrew originals before he denies. Let him turn to some most suggestive Egyptian *bas-reliefs*. One especially from the temple of Philae, represents a *scene of initiation*. Two Gods-Hierophants, one with the head of a hawk (the Sun), the other *ibis*-headed (Mercury, Thoth, the god of Wisdom and secret learning, the assessor of Osiris-Sun), are standing over the body of a candidate just initiated. They are in the act of pouring on his head a double stream of water (the water of life and new *birth*), which stream is interlaced in the shape of a cross and full of small ansated crosses. This is allegorical of the awakening of the candidate (now an Initiate) when the beams of the morning sun (Osiris) strike the crown of his head (*his entranced body*

* *Key to the Hebrew-Egyptian Mystery*, etc., pp. 300-301.

[This subject *has* been explained at length in *The Esoteric Tradition*, Vol. I, pp. 72-75, where the author, Dr. G. de Purucker, gives the esoteric background of this scriptural puzzle.—*Compiler*.]

being placed three days earlier on its wooden *tau*, so as to receive the rays). Then appeared the Hierophants-Initiators and the sacramental words were pronounced, visibly, to the Sun-Osiris, addressed in reality to the Spirit-Sun within, enlightening the newly-born man. Let the reader meditate on the connection of the Sun with the Cross in both its generative and spiritually regenerative capacities—from the highest antiquity. Let him examine the tomb of Beit-Oualy, in the reign of Ramses II, and find on it the crosses in every shape and position. Again, the same on the throne of that sovereign, and finally on a fragment from the Hall of the ancestors of Totmes III, preserved in the National Library of Paris, and which represents the adoration of Bakhan-Alenré.

In this extraordinary sculpture and painting one sees the disk of the Sun beaming upon an ansated cross placed upon a cross of which those of the Calvary were perfect copies. The ancient papyri mention these as the “hard couches of those who were in (spiritual) travail, the *act of giving birth to themselves*.” A quantity of such cruciform “couches” on which the candidate, thrown into a dead trance at the end of his supreme initiation, was placed and secured, were found in the underground halls of the Egyptian temples after their destruction. The worthy, ignorant Fathers of the Cyril and Theophilus types used them freely, believing they had been brought and concealed there by some new converts. Alone Origen, and after him Clemens Alexandrinus, and other ex-initiates, knew better. *But they preferred to keep silent*.*

* [The latter two whole paragraphs may be found verbatim, in *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II, pp. 558-59. It is probable that the name Bait-Oxly, as printed in the original edition of that work, is a misprint for the French form Beit-Oualy, or Beit el-Ouali. This is the same as Beit el-Wâli, in its present English rendering, and is the site of a temple of Rameses II, about fifty kilometers south of the First Cataract, on the west bank of the Nile, just south of the town of Kalabsha in Nubia. It is an Arabic name which means "The House of the Saint." However, no tombs are known to exist at this site, and so it is difficult to say what is meant by the above reference to a tomb.

IS THIS AN ERROR?

275

The Occultist, however, ought to ever bear in mind the words said by Ammian, that if "Truth is violated by falsehood," it may be and is "*equally outraged by silence.*" *

[As the subject of the above Editorial Notes is of considerable importance from the standpoint of scholarship, it has been thought advisable to incorporate at this point material which was published somewhat later in the year, and which contains a closing Note from the pen of H. P. B.—*Compiler.*]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

May, 1888

IS THIS AN ERROR?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 12, August, 1888, pp. 492-95]

In the Editors' notes to the article on "The Crucifixion of Man," in the May number of *Lucifer*, a quotation is given from the *Key to the Hebrew-Egyptian Mystery in the Source of Measures*. I have not seen this work and do not know the name of its author, but, judging from this specimen of his writings, he is very far from being a safe guide. From his way of treating the subject of the quotation, he is evidently not aware that the two Evangels in which the exclamation has been preserved reproduce the Chaldee translation or Targum of *Psalms*, xxii, 1. This would have been more familiar than the Hebrew

This passage, as found in *The Secret Doctrine*, spells the second name as Bakhan-Alearé. The Hall of the Ancestors was taken from the Temple of Karnak generations ago to Paris, and was later moved from the Bibliothèque Nationale to the Louvre. It depicts Thutmose (or Totmes) III worshipping his royal ancestors, those former kings of Egypt whom he deemed specially worthy of such worship. None of these kings has a name resembling Bakhan-Alenré or the other form of this name, and no such name is listed in the complete surveys of royal names of Egypt (such as Henri Gauthier, *Le Livre des rois de l'Égypte*, Cairo, 1908-17), in any catalogue of Egyptian names (such as Hermann Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*, Glückstadt, 1935 ff.), or any listing of ancient Egyptian gods and goddesses. So we are at a loss to understand what is meant by the above remarks on this subject.—*Compiler*.]

* [This refers to Ammianus Marcellinus' *History*, Book XXIX, i,15.—*Compiler*.]

original to a Jew of the period in the habit of mixing with and teaching the people, and might well have fallen from the lips of such an one dying under such circumstances. To confront the Chaldee with the Hebrew here, and claim that the one is a falsification of the other is to make an unwarranted statement. But there is a still greater mistake even than this in the quotation, for, to get the reading, "My God, my God, how thou dost glorify me!" out of the Chaldee translation, the author substitutes "*"%;%": for *1;8":, and, by so doing, himself falsifies the accepted utterance. When it is realized that the exclamation handed down by the Evangelist is a Chaldee version of a Hebrew original, it cannot but be admitted that the meaning of the Chaldee is determined by that of the Hebrew, of which it is a translation. This unquestionably is "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" In the attributed rendering of the author, the Hebrew word he has adopted, to support preconceived views, only signifies "glorify" in the sense by singing the praises (and not by the illumination) of the glorified subject.

I have never met with an example of the use of the Hebrew formula referred to in the sense "My God, my God, how thou dost glorify me!" Will the learned Editors of *Lucifer*, or any of its readers, who may have been more fortunate in this regard, kindly point one out to me?

EUPHRATES.

8th June, 1888.

[The above having been sent to the U.S.A. for the author of *The Source of Measures* to reply to his critic, the following is his answer. —Editor, *Lucifer*.]

NO ERROR

The paper of “Euphrates” finds me in the country without books of reference. The reason of the novel translation of the words “eli eli, lama sabachthani” is as follows:—The record of the New Testament must stand as its own original authority, for it has no other authentic source. We are bound, therefore, to take, accept, and follow, its own statements for what they appear. A Greek sentence, lettering Hebrew words, must be rendered into the Hebrew agreeably to the equivalents of the letters in the Greek text. For instance, and in this case, there are two words in the Hebrew square letter, of the same sound but of different letters and meaning. One is the Chaldee **Ⲫ**: and the other is the Hebrew **׃**. The first is, *anglicé*, “shâbāk,” meaning *to forsake*, and the other is *shâbâch*, meaning *to glorify*. These words are the ones supposed to be substituted for the word used in the Psalm, *azabthani*, the pure word for “*forsaken me*.” If in the Greek text, which is the *only* guide and authority we have, the word is found as **ϜϘϘ**, it cannot properly be rendered otherwise in the Hebrew, or square letter, than by (**׃**: or, *anglice*, *shâbâch*.

IS THIS AN ERROR?

277

The real word of the Greek text is **ϜϘϘ**<4, or in proper conversion ***1;׃**: or *shâbâchthani*, which does mean “*glorify me*,” and nothing else. Any change from this must and can be only by perversion, and by way of *correction* of the text of the New Testament. As used in the climacteric sentence of the whole symbolic fabricated drama, it was taken from the Mysteries, and never had any reality whatever. The matter has been referred to very learned Jews, and surprise has been expressed that in such a manifest difference between the indicated word and the correction adopted, *no comment* should exist of the fact of discrepancy, probably because it was thought best to slur, rather than lay the symbolic jugglery bare to the unthinking, ignorant herd.

Difficulties arising from some fatal obstacle to the conversion of a fixed and necessary symbolic real reading, and some plausible popular rendering to cover the symbolism, are not infrequent either in the Hebrew or Greek. Such an one is in the Hebrew sentence descriptive of the first child born into the world, wherein the child is said to be Jehovah himself, and where the vulgar are thrown off by the interposition of the word “*from*,” so as to be read: “a child *from*, or the gift of, Jehovah.” A singular instance of a deceptive reading is as follows: Margoliouth, a very learned Jew, calls attention to the fact that the wearing of the “*fringes*” is alluded to in the New Testament—in the case of the woman troubled with an issue of blood, who thought that if she should but touch the “*hem of his garment*” she would recover. Here he says the Greek word is “*Craspedon*,” meaning, literally, if she could but touch the “*fringes*” of his garment. The wearing of the *fringes* had been commanded, to keep one in mind of the laws and ordinances, to obey them, but in lapse of time the custom had merged into a superstitious use, and the fringes were thought of as possessing a potent magical virtue, in, and of themselves. By this the woman thought that she could be cured by the magical virtue if she but touched them. Then it is that perceiving that virtue had gone out of him, the Master said the woman was right, and thus endorsed the *fetish* and its curative property. But by the same reception *the garment* on which the fringes were worn was esteemed to be a much stronger *fetish*, and possessed of magical virtues far more potent than the fringes themselves. This garment had a name, and was specifically called the “*Talith*.” Now in the Gospel of Mark the narrative is such as to set forth the conviction of the magical properties of both the *fringes* and the *Talith* on which they were worn. While the woman having the issue of blood is being cured by her touch of the fringes, the ruler enters the crowd with information that his daughter is dead, and then follows the recital. He takes the girl by the hand and says “*Talitha cumi*,” which, being

interpreted, is *Damsel, I say unto thee, arise.*” The word “*Talith,*” is from the Hebrew *tâlāl*, meaning, *to clothe*, and means “*a garment,*” and that garment on which the *fringes* were worn. It has no such meaning as “*damsel.*” The sentence seems only proper as a command to a person addressed by a proper

name, as “*Talitha arise!*” But in the connection, to mention the word itself, was to give the whole symbolism away as embracing the *Talith* and the *Fringes* worn on it, as a favourite *fetish*, therefore the word was given to those who understood, and the paraphrase of “*Damsel, I say unto thee, arise,*” was made for the vulgar and the unlearned. It was an easy and cheap piece of innocent cheat. “*Cheap John*” miracles were performed with just as much ease as the fabrication of a nursery story to cover a corner puzzle or conundrum. It was of a piece with the story of boys making mud pies and birds, as to which the birds of one of the boys flew away. In another passage of the Greek we read “*why are ye baptized for the dead?*” where the broad unmeaning ,B4 is placed in the margin for the real word of the text *ββ, D* meaning “*for the salvation of*”; the real significance having reference to a custom of vicarious baptism by placing the dead unbaptised on a bench, with a live person underneath. The question was asked of the corpse: “*Wilt thou be baptised?*” with answer of proxy “*I will,*” and the live man was baptised *ββ, D JT < , 6DT <*, *in place of, or for the benefit or salvation of the dead.* So transparent a fraud would not do for an average public, although it might tend to lead the stupid towards “*High Church.*”

But one of the most interesting and instructive pieces of imposition is one recorded outside the sacred record, by a shepherd of the flock. It is contained in the rare history of that king of butchers Constantine, and of that chief theological diplomatist Eusebius. Constantine was a worshipper of Mithras, the Sun-God, whose priests were the Magi, who observed the natal day of that God every 25th of December or Christmas day, and whose mode of religion embraced *baptism, a eucharistic feast, confession, resurrection from the dead, and angelology with hell*: so running on all fours with the Christianity which Constantine co-adapted with his Mithraic observance, that the Christian fathers had to claim, to save themselves from the charge of theft, that the Devil with his usual cunning and astuteness had prophetically anticipated the whole business, to make a claim of priority when the *time should come* to ply his little game of thimble rig. Constantine was either for Mithras or the other, agreeably to circumstances, standing as he did half-way betwixt with the difference only of a name to call the thing by. His coin bore on the reverse, “*To the invincible Sun, my guardian,*” while the other “*first called Christians at Antioch,*” was lord of the *eighth* day, or the day of that same invincible Sun, called Sunday. Now the time came for this goody-goody to die, and he wished to make the work of his statesmanship complete, in the consolidation of the empire by the cementing influence of a new form of a very old Persian and Hebrew religion, to be enforced by the strong hand of the civil government. For this purpose he is baptised with great pomp and ceremony on Whitsun Sunday. And as to this, that arch-fraud Eusebius comments as follows: “*And on the Pentecostel Sunday itself, the seventh Lord’s day from Easter, AT THE NOONTIDE HOUR of the day, BY THE SUN, Constantine was received up to HIS GOD.*” Let us paraphrase the “*lay*” of our “*Now you see it and now you don’t.*” The sun being in the South as the

beauty and glory of the day—at high noon—on the meridian, the soul of our brother Constantine ascended in a *plumb line* directly to his God; and so says the master of the Lodge, Amen.”

Let us, to close, refer to a bare-faced interpolation in the sacred record, serving by deceiving locution the commendable purpose of a chain to bind the edifice of the Church of Constantine and Eusebius more firmly and compactly together. When the Master says to Peter: “*Thou art Peter the stone and on this stone I will*

found my *Church*, and the gates of Hell,” etc., there was nothing known but the Temple and Synagogue. The word Synagogue meant the *Congregation*, whereas it was long after, that the faction or split or separation was formed which was called *Ecclesia*, Church, or *Separatists* or *Come-outers*. Peter must have had an exceedingly stupid vacant look as he listened to this Hottentot statement. Now a very learned divine, who caught on to the difficulty, said that this was evidently an expression used *prophetically*, which by the assistance of the power of the Holy Spirit Peter was enabled to understand by *clairvoyance*. But “Go to! Go to!” It displays irreverence to look too closely into the make-up of the sacred text, for its composition. We should accept the broad ideal without any vain and prurient curiosity.

J.R.S.*

Cincinnati.

* [J. Ralston Skinner.]

NOTE

“Euphrates” certainly appears to assume a good deal. For why should there be introduced an entirely *imaginary* Chaldee version, of which no one ever heard before? It is generally held that the dialect of Galilee in the time of Jesus was Aramaic or Syriac. Euphrates’ substitution of the Chaldee 8 (*koph*) for the Hebrew ; (*cheth*) simply makes the whole passage inscrutably unintelligible.

The Editors of *Lucifer* regret that they cannot give Euphrates chapter and verse in support of the words in question being a sacramental formula used in initiations, since such details can be found only in *secret* books. But *one* of the said Editors can give her personal assurance that these words *are* so given in the *secret* works on initiation, and that she has herself seen them. Moreover, they were

common to all the greater Mysteries—those of Mithra and India, as well as the Egyptian and the Eleusinian. It is not improbable that a careful examination of the old Hindu works, and especially of the Egyptian papyri, may afford evidence of their use in the rites.—ED.*

* [It is evident that the Note is from the pen of H.P.B., the other Editor of *Lucifer* being at the time Mabel Collins.—*Compiler*.]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

May, 1888

A PUZZLE IN *ESOTERIC BUDDHISM*


[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 9, May, 1888, pp. 254-260]

To the Editor of *Lucifer*.

Since the two Editors repeatedly assert their willingness in their great impartiality to publish even “personal remarks” upon themselves (Vide *Lucifer*, Vol. I, February, 1888, p. 432), I avail myself of the opportunity. Having read *Esoteric Buddhism* with much interest and general approval of the main drift of its teachings, I am anxious, with your kind permission, to formulate an objection to some points in Mr. Sinnett’s view of Evolution which have completely staggered my friends and myself. They appear to upset once and for all the explanation of the origin of man propounded by that popular author. Mr. Sinnett has, however, so uniformly expressed his willingness to answer honest criticism that I may, perhaps, hope for his assistance in solving this difficulty. Meanwhile, despite my favourable bias towards Theosophy, I must, perforce, express my conviction that one aspect of the Esoteric Doctrine—*supposing of course that Mr. Sinnett is to be regarded as absolutely authoritative on the point*—is opposed to Science. The point is one of fundamental importance as will be readily recognised by all—except, perhaps, by some too . . . well, too admiring Theosophists.

In *Esoteric Buddhism* we are confronted with a general acceptance of Darwinism. Physical Man, in particular, is said to have been evolved from ape ancestors.

“Man, says the Darwinian, *was once an ape*. Quite true; but the ape known [??] to the Darwinian will never become a man—*i.e.*, the *form* will not change from generation to generation till the tail disappears and the hands turn into feet, and so on . . . if we go back far enough, we come to a period at which there were no human forms ready developed on earth. *When spiritual monads, travelling on the earliest or lowest human level, were thus beginning to come round* [the Planetary



ALFRED PERCY SINNETT
(1840-1921)

Reproduced from *The Theosophist*, Vol. XXX, September, 1909.

chain to this globe], *their onward pressure in a world at that time containing none but animal forms provoked the improvement of the highest of these into the required form—the much-talked-of missing link.*—(*Esoteric Buddhism*, 5th ed. pp. 82-3.)

And again:

“. . . the mineral kingdom will no more develop the vegetable kingdom . . . until it receives an impulse from without, than *the earth was able to develop man from the ape* till it received an impulse from without.” (*Ibid.*, p. 89.)

The theory here broached is to the effect that the development of the ape into man was brought about by the incarnation of Human Egos from the last planet in the septenary chain of globes. I may here remark that in referring to our supposed animal progenitors as the apes “known” to the Darwinian, Mr. Sinnett exceeds in audacity the boldest Evolutionist. For this hypothetical creature is not known at all, being conspicuous by its absence from any deposits yet explored. This, however, is a minor point. The real indictment to which I have been leading up is to follow.

We are told that occultists divide the term Human existence on this planet into seven Race Periods. At the present time the 5th of these races, the Aryan, is in the ascendant, while the 4th is still represented by teeming populaces. The 3rd is almost extinct. Now on page 106 of *Esoteric Buddhism* we are told regarding the 4th Race men that:—

“In the Eocene Age . . . even in its very first part, the great cycle of the fourth race men, the Atlanteans, had already reached its highest point.”

Here, then, is a distinct landmark in the Esoteric Chronology pointed out to us. Summarizing these data we find ourselves confronted with the following propositions:

- (1) Humanity was developed physically from apes.
- (2) The 4th Race reached its prime at the *commencement* of the Eocene Age of Geology.
- (3) The *three first Races* (1st, 2nd, and 3rd) must therefore have antedated the Eocene Age by an enormous extent of time, even if we allow a much shorter period for their development than for the 4th and 5th. The 1st race, in fact, must have preceded the Tertiary Period by several millions of years.
- (4) This *pre-Tertiary 1st Race* was therefore derived from a *still earlier ape stock*.

At this point the fabric of theory collapses. It is necessary to say that Science has been *unable to find a trace of an anthropoid ape previous even to the relatively late Miocene Age?* Now the Eocene precede the Miocene rocks, and the 1st Race, as already shown, must have antedated even the era of the Eocene; it must have stretched far back into that dim and distant past when the chalk cliffs of the Secondary period

were deposited! How then can Mr. Sinnett claim his view of Human Evolution as merely “complementary” to Darwin’s, when he binds himself to a chronology compared with the duration of which the Evolutionist one sinks into insignificance? Palaeontologists unanimously refuse to admit the existence of the higher apes previous to the Tertiary Period, and Darwin would have smiled at the notion. As a matter of fact, only the *very lowest* mammals had made their appearance before the Eocene strata were formed. This is the view of the Science to which Mr. Sinnett invites us to bow with due reverence. Apparently he has been unconsciously nursing a viper in his bosom, for the same Science now “turns and strikes him.” I ask, HOW THEN WAS THE

1ST RACE EVOLVED FROM APES AEONS OF YEARS BEFORE SUCH APES EXISTED? If Mr. Sinnett will kindly return a satisfactory answer to this query, he will have largely contributed to relieve the intellectual difficulties in the way of—

AN AGNOSTIC STUDENT OF THEOSOPHY.

April 20, Aberdeen.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The above letter is an arraignment either of the Esoteric Doctrine or of its expounders. Now the doctrine itself is unassailable, though its expounders may often make mistakes in their presentation of it; particularly when, as in the case of the author of *Esoteric Buddhism*, the writer was only very partially informed upon the subjects he treats of.

Leaving the author of *Esoteric Buddhism* to answer the criticism for himself, one of the editors of *Lucifer*, as a person indirectly concerned with the production of the said work, begs the privilege of saying a few words upon the subject. It was as a special favour to herself that the teachings contained in Mr. Sinnett's volume were first begun; she was the only one of the party concerned with these studies who had received for a series of years instruction in them. Therefore no one can know better than herself what was, or was not, meant in such or another tenet of this particular doctrine.

Our correspondent should bear in mind therefore, that:

(a) At the time of the publication of *Esoteric Buddhism* (*Budhism* * would be more correct) the available Occult

* *Budhism* would mean "Wisdom," from *Budha*, "a sage," "a wise man," and the *imperative verb* "*Budhyadhvam*," "Know"; and *Buddhism*

data were comparatively scanty in its author's hands. Otherwise, he would not have seemed to derive man from the ape—a theory absurd and *impossible* in the sight of the MASTERS.

(b) Only a tentative effort was being cautiously made to test the readiness of the public to assimilate the elements of Esoteric philosophy.

For Mr. Sinnett was left largely to his own resources and speculations and very naturally followed the bend of his own mind, which, though greatly favouring esoteric philosophy, was, nevertheless, decidedly biassed by modern science. Consequently, the revelations then broached were purposely designed to rather afford a bird's-eye view of the doctrine than to render a detailed treatment of any special problem possible. The teachings were not given at first with the object of publication. No regular systematic teaching was ever contemplated, nor could it be so given to a layman; therefore that teaching consisted of detached bits of information in the shape of answers in private letters to questions offered upon most varied subjects, on Cosmogony and Psychology, Theogony and

Anthropology, and so on. Moreover, more queries were left without any reply and full explanation refused—as the latter belong to the mysteries of Eastern Initiation—than there were problems solved. This has, subsequently, proved a very wise policy. It is not at this stage of absolute materialism on the one hand, of cautious agnosticism on the other, and of fluctuating uncertainty as regards almost every individual speculation among the most eminent men

is the religious philosophy of Gautama, the Buddha. As Dr. H. H. Wilson very truly remarks in his translation of *Vishnu-Purana*, “Much erroneous speculation has originated in confounding Budha, the son of Soma (the Moon) and the regent of the planet Mercury—‘he who knows’ ‘the intelligent,’—with Buddha, any deified [?] mortal, or ‘he by whom truth is known,’ or as individually applicable, Gautama or Bākya, Son of the Raja Boddhodana. The two characters have nothing in common; and the names are identical, only when one or other is misspelt.” “Budhism” has preceded *Buddhism* by long ages and is pre-Vedic.

of Science, that *the full* revelation of the archaic scheme of anthropology would be advisable. In the days of Pythagoras the heliocentric system was a mystery taught only in the silence and secrecy of the inner Temples; and Socrates was put to death for divulging it, under the inspiration of his DAIMON. Now-a-days, the revealers of systems which clash with religion or science are not put to physical death, but they are slowly tortured to their dying hour with open calumny and secret persecutions, when ridicule proves to be of no avail. Thus, a full statement of even an abridged and hardly defined “Esoteric Budhism” would do more harm than good. Only *certain portions* of it can be given, and they will be given very soon.

Nevertheless, as our critic readily admits, all these difficulties notwithstanding, Mr. Sinnett has produced a most interesting and valuable work. That, in his too exaggerated respect and admiration for modern science, he seems to have somewhat materialized the teachings is what every metaphysician will admit. But it is also true, that the writer of *Esoteric Buddhism* would be the last man to claim any more “*authoritative* character” for his book, than what is given to it by the few verbatim quotations from the teachings of a Master, more particularly when treating of such moot questions as that of Evolution. The point on which his critic lays such stress—the incompatibility of the statements made in his work as to the origin of Man on this planet—certainly invalidates Mr. Sinnett’s attempted reconciliation (if it is such) of the Darwinian and Esoteric Schemes of human evolution. But at this every true Theosophist, who expects no recognition of the truths he believes in at present, but feels sure of their subsequent triumph at a future day, can only rejoice. Scientific theories or rather *conjectures* are really too materialistic to be reconciled with “*Esoteric Budhism*.”

As the whole problem, however, is one of great complexity it would be out of the question to do any justice to it in the space of a brief note. The “Budhism” of the archaic,

prehistoric ages is not a subject that can be disposed of in a single little volume. Suffice it to say that the larger portion of the coming *Secret Doctrine* is devoted to the

elucidation of the true esoteric views as to Man's origin and social development—hardly mentioned in *Esoteric Buddhism*. And to this source we must be permitted to refer the inquirer.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

May, 1888

PRACTICAL OCCULTISM

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 9, May, 1888, pp. 257-258]

In a very interesting article in last month's number entitled "Practical Occultism" it is stated that from the moment a "Master" begins to teach a "chela" he takes on himself all the sins of that chela in connection with the occult sciences until the moment when initiation makes the chela a master and responsible in his turn.

For the Western mind, steeped as it has been for generations in "Individualism," it is very difficult to recognise the justice and consequently the truth of this statement, and it is very much to be desired that some further explanation should be given for a fact which some few may feel intuitively but for which they are quite unable to give any logical reason.

S. E.

EDITORS' REPLY.—The best logical reason for it is the fact that even in common daily life, parents, nurses, tutors and instructors are generally held responsible for the habits and future ethics of a child. The little unfortunate wretch who is trained by his parents to pick pockets in the streets is not responsible for the sin, but the effects of it fall heavily on those who have impressed on his mind that it was the right thing to do. Let us hope that the Western Mind, although being "steeped in Individualism," has not become so dulled thereby as not to perceive that there would be neither logic nor justice were it otherwise. And if the moulders of the plastic mind of the yet unreasoning child must be held responsible, in this world of effects for his sins of omission and commission during his childhood and for effects produced by their early training in after-life, how much more the "Spiritual Guru"? The latter taking the student by the hand leads him into, and

introduces him to a world entirely unknown to the pupil For this world is that of the invisible but ever-potent CAUSALITY, the subtle, yet never-breaking thread that is the action, agent and power of Karma, and Karma itself in the field of divine mind. Once acquainted with this no adept can any longer plead ignorance in the event of even an action, good and meritorious in its *motive*, producing evil as its result; since acquaintance with this mysterious realm gives the means to the Occultist of foreseeing the two paths opening before every premeditated as unpremeditated action, and thus puts him in a position to know with certainty what will be the results in one or the other case. So long then, as the pupil acts upon this principle, but is too ignorant to be sure of his vision and powers of discrimination, is it not natural that it is the *guide* who should be responsible for

the sins of him whom he has led into those dangerous regions?

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

May, 1888

WHY DO ANIMALS SUFFER?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 9, May, 1888, pp. 258-259]

Q. Is it possible for me who loves the animals to learn how to get more power than I have to help them in their sufferings?

A. Genuine unselfish LOVE combined with WILL, is a “power” in itself. They who love animals ought to show that affection in a more efficient way than by covering their pets with ribbons and sending them to howl and scratch at the prize exhibitions.

Q. Why do the noblest animals suffer so much at the hands of men? I need not enlarge or try to explain this question. Cities are torture places for the animals who can be turned to any account for use or amusement by man! And these are always the most noble.

WHY DO ANIMALS SUFFER?

287

A. In the *Sutras*, or the Aphorisms of the *Karma-pa*, a sect which is an offshoot of the great Gelukpa (yellow caps) sect in Tibet, and whose name bespeaks its tenets—“the believers in the efficacy of Karma,” (action, or good works)—an Upasaka inquires of his Master, why the fate of the poor animals had so changed of late? Never was an animal killed or treated unkindly in the vicinity of Buddhist or other temples in China, in days of old, while now, they are slaughtered and freely sold at the markets of various cities, etc. The answer is suggestive:

. . . “Lay not nature under the accusation of this unparalleled injustice. Do not seek in vain for Karmic effects to explain the cruelty, for the *Tenbrel Chugnyi* (causal connection, *Nidâna*) shall teach thee none. It is the unwelcome advent of the Peling (Christian foreigner), whose three fierce gods refused to provide for the protection of the weak and *little ones* (animals), that is answerable for the ceaseless and heart-rending sufferings of our dumb companions. . . .

The answer to the above query is here in a nutshell. It may be useful, if once more disagreeable, to some religionists to be told that the blame for this universal suffering falls entirely upon our Western religion and early education. Every philosophical Eastern system, every religion and sect in antiquity—the Brahmanical, Egyptian, Chinese and finally, the purest as the noblest of all the existing systems of ethics, Buddhism—inculcates kindness and protection to every living creature, from animal and bird down to the creeping thing and even the reptile. Alone, our Western religion stands in

its isolation, as a monument of the most gigantic *human* selfishness ever evolved by human brain, without one word in favour of, or for the protection of the poor animal. Quite the reverse. For theology, underlining a sentence in the Jehovistic chapter of “Creation,” interprets it as a proof that animals, as all the rest, were created for man! *Ergo*—sport has become one of the *noblest* amusements of the upper ten. Hence—poor innocent birds wounded, tortured and killed every autumn by the million, all over the Christian countries, for man’s recreation. Hence

also, unkindness, often cold-blooded cruelty, during the youth of horse and bullock, brutal indifference to its fate when age has rendered it unfit for work, and ingratitude after years of hard labour for, and in the service of man. In whatever country the European steps in, there begins the slaughter of the animals and their useless decimation.

“Has the prisoner ever killed *for his pleasure* animals?” inquired a Buddhist Judge at a border town in China, *infected* with pious European Churchmen and missionaries, of a man accused of having murdered his sister. And having been answered in the affirmative, as the prisoner had been a servant in the employ of a Russian colonel, “a mighty hunter before the Lord,” the Judge had no need of any other evidence and the murderer was found “guilty”—justly, as his subsequent confession proved.

Is Christianity or even the Christian layman to be blamed for it? Neither. It is the pernicious system of theology, long centuries of theocracy, and the ferocious, ever-increasing selfishness in the Western civilized countries. What *can* we do?

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

May, 1888

IS THERE NO HOPE?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 9, May, 1888, pp. 259-260]

I think, after reading the conditions necessary for Occult study given in the April number of *Lucifer*, that it would be as well for the readers of this magazine to give up all hopes of becoming Occultists. In Britain, except inside a monastery, I hardly think it possible that such conditions could ever be realised. In my future capacity of medical doctor (if the gods are so benign) the eighth condition would be quite exclusive; this is most unfortunate, as it seems to me that the study of Occultism is peculiarly essential for a successful practice of the medical profession.*

I have the following question to ask you, and will be glad to be favoured with a reply through the medium of *Lucifer*. Is it possible to study Occultism in Britain?

* By "successful practice" I mean, successful to everybody concerned.

WHO ARE THE EURASIANS?

289

Before concluding, I feel compelled to inform you that I admire your magazine as a scientific production, and that I really and truly classify it along with the *Imitation of Christ* among my text books of religion.

Yours,

DAVID CRICHTON.

Marischall College, Aberdeen.

EDITORS' REPLY—This is a too pessimistic view to entertain. One may study with profit the Occult Sciences without rushing into the higher Occultism. In the case of our correspondent especially, and in his future capacity of medical doctor, the Occult knowledge of simples and minerals, and the curative powers of certain things in Nature, is far more important and useful than metaphysical and psychological Occultism or *Theophany*. And this he can do better by studying and trying to understand Paracelsus and the two Van Helmonts, than by assimilating Patañjali and the methods of Taraka-Raja-Yoga.

It is possible to study "Occultism" (the Occult sciences or arts is more correct) in Britain, as on any other point of the globe; though owing to the tremendously adverse conditions created by the intense selfishness that prevails in the country, and a magnetism which is repellant to a free manifestation of Spirituality—solitude is the best condition for study. See Editorial in this issue.*

* ["Occultism versus the Occult Arts," *Lucifer*, Vol. II, May, 1888, in the present Volume.—Compiler.]

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**
May, 1888

WHO ARE THE EURASIANS?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 9, May, 1888, p. 260]

As you expressly invite correspondence with regard to subjects connected with our work, Theosophy, I beg to ask of you *who are* the *Eurasians* mentioned at p. 147 of *Lucifer* for April, and what are their tenets or practices? As I never heard of these before and have been consulting all my books on Hindoo religions, but *cannot* find any notice of them, at least under the name of Eurasians.

Fraternally yours,

G. OUSELEY, F.T.S.

290

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

EDITORS' NOTE.—They are the Euro (pean) asians, or half Europeans by the fathers and Asiatics—Hindus or Mussulmen—on the maternal side. They are called Eurasians in India, where they number over 1,000,000, and are also referred to as “half-castes,” etc. They are Christians, of course, and many of them are very intelligent, cultured and respectable people. Nevertheless, they are as kindly snubbed by the Anglo-Indians as are the “heathen” natives—the “niggers” of India—themselves, and more; perhaps because they are the living witnesses to the practical and high morality imported into the country together with the Gospel of Christ and the 7th commandment of the Decalogue. It has to be confessed, however, that the “snubbing” has an excuse. It must be rather annoying to the cultured Englishmen, to be continually confronted with their incarnated sins.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

May, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 9, May, 1888, p. 253]

[In a review of Charles W. Heckethorn's volume of poems entitled *Roses and Thorns*, the following passage with its appended footnote bears the characteristics of H.P.B.'s style:]

Mr. Heckethorn identifies Böhme's "Three *First* Properties of Nature" with the "Three Mothers" of Goethe's *Faust*. He is quite right, but might have added that the idea, and even its form, are much older than Böhme. Hermes speaks of the *Tres Matres*—Light, Heat, and Electricity*—who showed to him the mysterious progress of work in Nature; and the "Three Mothers" were much talked about by the older Rosicrucians, who certainly did not derive their knowledge from Böhme.

* With the Kabalists, "the Three Mothers" in *Sepher Yetzirah* are Air, Water and Fire. They are EMeS, or :/!

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

THEOSOPHY OR JESUITISM?

291

THEOSOPHY OR JESUITISM?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 10, June, 1888, pp. 261-272]

[*The superior numbers occurring in the main body of this article and in the footnotes refer to Compiler's Notes appended at the end of the article.*]

“ . . . choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites. . . .”

—*Joshua*, xxiv, 15.

The thirteenth number of *Le Lotus*, the recognised organ of Theosophy, among many articles of undeniable interest, contains one by Madame Blavatsky in reply to the Abbé Roca. The eminent writer, who is certainly the most learned woman of our acquaintance, * discusses the following question: “*Has Jesus ever existed?*” † She destroys the Christian legend, in its details, at least, with irrecusable texts which are not usually consulted by religious historians.¹

The article is producing a profound sensation in the Catholic and Judeo-Catholic swamp: we are not surprised at this, for the author's arguments are such as it is difficult to break down, even were one accustomed to the Byzantine disputes of theology.

—*Paris*, evening paper, of May 12th, 1888.

The series of articles, one of which is referred to in the above quotation from a well-known French evening paper, was originally called forth by an article in *Le Lotus* by the Abbé Roca, a translation of which was published in the January number of *Lucifer*.²

* The humble individual of that name renders thanks to the editor of *Paris*: not so much for the flattering opinion expressed as for the rare surprise to find the name of “Blavatsky,” for once, neither preceded nor followed by any of the usual abusive epithets and adjectives which the highly-cultured English and American newspapers and their gentlemanly editors are so fond of coupling with the said cognomen.—*Ed.* [H. P. B.]

† The question is rather: Did the “historical” Jesus ever exist?—*Ed.* [H. P. B.]

These articles, it would seem, have stirred up many slumbering animosities. They appear, in particular, to have touched the Jesuit party in France somewhat nearly. Several correspondents have written calling attention to the danger incurred by Theosophists in raising up against themselves such virulent and powerful foes. Some of our friends would have us keep silent on these topics. Such is not, however, the policy of *Lucifer*, nor ever will be. Therefore, the present opportunity is taken to state, once for all, the views which Theosophists and Occultists entertain with regard to the Society of Jesus. At the same time, all those who are pursuing in life's great wilderness of vain evanescent pleasures and empty conventionalities *an ideal worth living for*, are offered the choice between the two now once more rising powers—the Alpha and the Omega at the two opposite ends of the realm of giddy, idle existence—THEOSOPHY and JESUITISM.

For, in the field of religious and intellectual pursuits, these two are the only luminaries—a *good* and an *evil* star, truly—glimmering once more from behind the mists of the Past, and ascending on the horizon of mental activities. They are the only two powers capable in the present day of extricating one thirsty for intellectual life from the clammy slush of the stagnant pool known as Modern Society, so crystallized in its cant, so dreary and monotonous in its squirrel-like motion around the wheel of fashion. Theosophy and Jesuitism are the two opposite poles, one far above, the other far below even that stagnant marsh. Both offer power—one to the spiritual, the other to the psychic and intellectual Ego in man. The former is “the wisdom that is from *above*. . . first pure, then peaceable, gentle . . . full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy,” while the latter is the “wisdom [that] *descendeth not from above*, but is earthly, sensual, DEVILISH.” * One is the power of Light, the other that of Darkness. . . .

A question will surely be asked: “Why should anyone choose between the two? Cannot one remain in the world,

* *James' General Epistle*, chapter iii, 15, 17.

a good Christian of whatever church, without gravitating to either of these poles?” Most undeniably, one can do so, for a few more years to come. But the cycle is rapidly approaching the last limit of its turning point. One out of the three great churches of Christendom is split into atomic sects, whose number increases yearly; and a house divided against itself, as is the Protestant Church—MUST FALL. The third, the Roman Catholic, the only one that has hitherto succeeded in appearing to retain all its integrity, is rapidly decaying from within. It is honeycombed throughout, and is being devoured by the ravenous microbes begotten by Loyola.

It is no better now than a Dead Sea fruit, fair for some to look at, but full of the

rotteness of decay and death within. Roman Catholicism is but a name. As a Church it is a phantom of the Past and a mask. It is absolutely and indissolubly bound up with, and fettered by the Society of Ignatius Loyola; for, as rightly expressed by Lord Robert Montagu, the Roman Catholic Church is now “the largest secret society in the world, beside which Freemasonry is but a pigmy.”³ Protestantism is slowly, insidiously, but as surely, infected with Latinism—the new ritualistic sects of the High Church, and such men among its clergy as Father Rivington, being undeniable evidence of it. In fifty years more at the present rate of success of Latinism among the “upper ten,” the English aristocracy will have returned to the faith of King Charles II, and its servile copyist—mixed Society—will have followed suit. And then the Jesuits will begin to reign alone and supreme over the Christian portions of the globe, for they have crept even into the Greek Church.

It is vain to argue and claim a difference between Jesuitism and Roman Catholicism proper, for the latter is now sucked into and inseparably amalgamated with the former. We have public assurance for it in the Pastoral of 1876 by the Bishop of Cambrai. “*Clericalism, Ultramontanism and Jesuitism are one and the same thing—that is to say, Roman Catholicism*—and the distinctions between them have been created by the enemies of religion,” says the “Pastoral.” “There was a time,” adds Monseigneur

the Cardinal, “when a certain theological opinion was commonly professed in France concerning the authority of the Pope. . . . It was restricted to our nation, and was of recent origin. The civil power during a century and a half imposed official instruction. Those who professed these opinions were called Gallicans, and those who protested were called Ultramontanes, because they had their doctrinal centre beyond the Alps, at Rome. Today *the distinction between the two schools is no longer admissible*. Theological Gallicanism can no longer exist, since this opinion has ceased to be tolerated by the Church. *It has been solemnly condemned, past all return, by the Oecumenical Council of the Vatican. ONE CANNOT NOW BE CATHOLIC WITHOUT BEING ULTRAMONTANE—AND JESUIT.*”⁴

A plain statement; and as cool as it is plain.

The Pastoral made a certain noise in France and in the Catholic world, but was soon forgotten. And as two centuries have rolled away since *an exposé* of the infamous principles of the Jesuits was made (of which we will speak presently), the “Black Militia” of Loyola has had ample time to lie so successfully in denying the just charges, that even now, when the present Pope has brilliantly sanctioned the utterance of the Bishop of Cambrai, the Roman Catholics will hardly confess to such a thing. Strange exhibition of infallibility in the Popes! The “infallible” Pope, Clement XIV (Ganganelli), suppressed the Jesuits on the 21st of July, 1773, and yet they came to life again; the “infallible” Pope, Pius VII, re-established them on the 7th of August, 1814.⁵ The infallible Pope Pius IX,⁶ travelled, during the whole of his long Pontificate, between the Scylla and Charybdis of the Jesuit question; his infallibility helping him very little. And now the “infallible” Leo XIII

(fatal figures!)⁷ raises the Jesuits again to the highest pinnacle of their sinister and graceless glory.

The recent *Brevet* of the Pope (hardly two years old) dated July 13th (the same fatal figures), 1886, is an event, the importance of which can never be overvalued. It begins with the words *Dolemus inter alia*, and reinstalls the Jesuits in all the rights of the Order that had ever been

cancelled. It was a *manifesto* and a loud defiant insult to all the Christian nations of the New and the Old worlds. From an article by Louis Lambert in the *Gaulois* (August 18th, 1886) we learn that “In 1750 there were 40,000 Jesuits all over the world. In 1800, *officially* they were reckoned at about 1,000 men, only. In 1886, they numbered between 7 and 8,000.”⁸ This last modest number can well be doubted. For, verily now—

Where you meet a man believing in the salutary nature of falsehoods, or the divine authority of things doubtful, and fancying that to serve the good cause he must call the devil to his aid, there is a follower of Unsaint Ignatius,

says Carlyle, and adds of that black militia of Ignatius that:

They have given a new substantive to modern languages. The word Jesuitism now, in all countries, expresses an idea for which there was in nature no prototype before. Not till these last centuries had the human soul generated that abomination, or needed to name it. Truly they have achieved great things in the world, and a general result that we may call stupendous.⁹

And now since their reinstalment in Germany and elsewhere, they will achieve still grander and more stupendous results. For the future can be best read by the past. Unfortunately in this year of the Pope’s jubilee the civilized portions of humanity—even the Protestant ones—seem to have entirely forgotten that past. Let then those who profess to despise Theosophy, the fair child of early Aryan thought and Alexandrian Neo-Platonism, bow before the monstrous Fiend of the Age, but let them not forget at the same time its history.

It is curious to observe, how persistently the Order has assailed everything like Occultism from the earliest times, and Theosophy since the foundation of its last Society, which is ours. The Moors and the Jews of Spain felt the weight of the oppressive hand of Obscurantism no less than did the Kabalists and Alchemists of the Middle Ages. One would think Esoteric philosophy and especially the Occult Arts, or Magic, were an abomination to those good

holy fathers? And so indeed they would have the world believe. But when one studies history and the works of their own authors published with the *imprimatur* of the Order, what does one find? That the *Jesuits have practised not only Occultism, but BLACK MAGIC in its worst form,* more than any other body of men; and that to it they owe in large measure their power and influence!*

To refresh the memory of our readers and *all those whom it may concern*, a short summary of the doings and actings of our good friends, may be once more attempted. For those who are inclined to laugh, and deny the subterranean and truly infernal means used by “Ignatius’ black militia,” we may state facts!

In *Isis Unveiled* it was said of the *holy* Fraternity that—

. . . though established only in 1535 to 1540—in 1555 there was already general outcry raised against them.¹⁰

And now once more—

. . . that crafty, learned, conscienceless, terrible soul of Jesuitism, within the body of Romanism, is slowly but surely possessing itself of the whole prestige and spiritual power that clings to it. Throughout the whole of antiquity, where, in what land, can we find anything like this Order or anything even approaching it? The cry of an outraged public morality was raised against this Order from its very birth. Barely fifteen years had elapsed after the bull approving its constitution was promulgated, when its members began to be driven away from one place to the other. Portugal and the Low Countries got rid of them, in 1578, France in 1594; Venice in 1606; Naples in 1622. From St. Petersburg they were expelled in 1815, and from all Russia in 1820. [*Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 352.]

The writer begs to remark to the readers, that this, which was written in 1875, applies admirably and with still more force in 1888. Also that the statements that follow in quotation marks may be all verified. And thirdly, that the principles (*principii*) of the Jesuits that

* Mesmerism or HYPNOTISM is a prominent factor in Occultism. It is *magic*. The Jesuits were acquainted with and practised it ages before Mesmer and Charcot.—*Ed.* [H. P. B.]

are now brought forward, are extracted from authenticated MSS. or folios printed by various members themselves of this very distinguished body. Therefore, they can be checked and verified in the British Museum and Bodleian Library with still more ease than in our works.

. . . . Many are copied from the large Quarto* published by the authority of, and verified and collated by the Commissioners of the French Parliament. The statements therein were collected and presented to the King, in

order that, as the *Arrest du Parlement du 5 Mars, 1762* expresses it, “the elder son of the Church might be made aware of the perversity of this doctrine. A doctrine authorizing Theft, Lying, Perjury, Impurity, every Passion and Crime, teaching Homicide, Parricide, and Regicide, overthrowing religion in order to substitute for it superstition, by favouring *Sorcery*, Blasphemy, Irreligion, and Idolatry etc.”¹² Let us then examine the ideas on *magic* of the Jesuits [that magic which they are pleased to call *devilish* and *Satanic* when studied by the Theosophists]. Writing on this subject in his secret instructions, Anthony Escobar says:

“It is lawful to make use of the science acquired *through the assistance of the devil*, provided the preservation and use of that knowledge do not depend upon the devil: *for the knowledge is good in itself, and the sin by which it was acquired is gone by.*”† Hence why should not a Jesuit cheat the Devil as well as he cheats every layman?

“*Astrologers and soothsayers are either bound, or are not bound, to restore the reward of their divination, if the event does not come to pass.*”

“I own,” remarks the *good* Father Escobar, “that the former opinion does not at all please me; because, when the astrologer or diviner has exerted all the diligence *in the diabolic art* which is essential to his purpose, he has fulfilled his duty, whatever may be the result.

* Extracts from this *Arrest* were compiled into a work in 4 vols., 12mo., which appeared at Paris, in 1762, and was known as *Extraits des Assertions*, etc. In a work entitled *Réponse aux Assertions*, an attempt was made by the Jesuits to throw discredit upon the facts collected by the Commissioners of the French Parliament in 1762, as for the most part malicious fabrications. “To ascertain the validity of this impeachment,” says the author of *The Principles of the Jesuits* [pp. v-vi],¹¹ “the libraries of the two Universities, of the British Museum and of Sion College have been searched for the authors cited; and in every instance where the volume could be found, the correctness of the citation has been established.” [*Isis Unveiled* Vol. II, p. 353, footnote.]

† *Theologia moralis*, Lugduni, 1663. Tom. IV, lib. 28, sect. 1, de praecept. 1, cap. 20, n. 184, p. 25.¹³

As the physician, when he has made use of medicines according to the principles of his professional knowledge, is not bound to restore the fee which he has received if his patient should die; so neither is the astrologer bound to restore his charge and costs to the person who has consulted him, except when he has used no effort, or was ignorant of his diabolic art; because, when he has used his endeavors, he has not deceived.” *

. . . . Busembaum and Lacroix, in *Theologia Moralis*, † say, “Palmistry may be considered lawful, if from the lines and divisions of the hands, it can ascertain the disposition of the body, and conjecture with probability the propensities and affections of the soul. . . .”‡

This noble fraternity, which many preachers have of late so vehemently denied to have ever been a *secret* one, has been sufficiently proved as such. Their constitutions were translated into Latin by the Jesuit Polancus, and printed in the college of the Society at Rome, in 1558. “They were jealously kept secret, the greater part of the Jesuits themselves knowing only extracts from them. *They were never produced to the light until 1761, when they were published by order of the French Parliament* [in 1761, 1762], in the famous process of Father Lavalette.” §. The Jesuits reckon it among the greatest achievements of their Order that Loyola supported, by a special memorial to the Pope, a petition for the reorganization of that abominable and abhorred instrument of wholesale butchery—the infamous tribunal of the Inquisition.

This Order of Jesuits is now all-powerful in Rome. They have been reinstated in the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, in the Department of the Secretary of State, and in the Ministry of

Foreign Affairs. The Pontifical Government was for years previous to Victor Emanuel's occupation of Rome entirely in their hands —*Isis Unveiled*, 1877, Vol. II, pp. 353-55.

What was the origin of that order? It may be stated in a few words. In the year 1534, on August 16th, an ex-officer and “Knight of the Virgin,” from the Biscayan

* *Ibid.*, sect. 2, de praecept. 1, probl. 113, no. 584, p. 77.¹⁴

† *Theologia Moralis . . . nunc pluribus partibus aucta à R.. P. Claudio Lacroix, Societatis Jesu. Coloniae, 1757 (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1733. Ed. Mus. Brit.)*.¹⁵

‡ Tom. II, lib. 3, part. 1, Tract. 1, cap. 1, dub. 2, resol. 8, p. 183. What a pity that the counsel for the defence had not bethought them to cite this orthodox legalization of “cheating by palmistry or otherwise,” at the recent religio-scientific prosecution of the medium Slade, in London.

§ G. B. Nicolini: *History of the Jeuits*, page 30.¹⁶

Provinces, and the proprietor of the magnificent castle of *Casa Solar*—Ignatius Loyola,* became the hero of the following incident. In the subterranean chapel of the Church of Montmartre, surrounded by a few priests and students of theology, he received their pledges to devote their whole lives to the spreading of Roman Catholicism by every and all means, whether good or foul; and he was thus enabled to establish a new Order. Loyola proposed to his six chief companions that their Order should be a *militant* one, in order to fight for the interests of the *Holy* seat of Roman Catholicism. Two means were adopted to make the object answer; the education of youth, and proselytism (*apostolat*). This was during the reign of Pope Paul III, who gave his full sympathy to the new scheme. Hence in 1540 was published the famous papal bull—*Regimini militantis ecclesiae* (the regimen of the warring, or *militant* Church)—after which the Order began increasing rapidly in numbers and power¹⁷.

At the death of Loyola, the society counted more than one thousand Jesuits, though admission into the ranks was, as alleged, surrounded with extraordinary difficulties. It was another celebrated and unprecedented bull, issued by Pope Julius the III in 1552,¹⁸ that brought the Order of Jesus to such eminence and helped it towards such rapid increase; for it placed the society outside and *beyond* the jurisdiction of local ecclesiastical authority, granted the Order its own laws, and permitted it to recognise but one supreme authority—that of its General, whose residence was then at Rome. The results of such an arrangement proved fatal to the Secular Church. High prelates and Cardinals had very often to tremble before a simple subordinate of the Society of Jesus. Its generals always got the upper hand in Rome, and enjoyed the unlimited confidence of the Popes, who thus frequently became tools in the hands of the Order. Naturally enough, in those days when political power was one of the rights of the “Vicegerants of God”—the strength of the crafty society became

* Or “*St. Inigo* the Biscayan,” by his true name.

simply tremendous. In the name of the Popes, the Jesuits thus granted to themselves unheard-of privileges, which they enjoyed unstintedly up to the year 1773. In that year, Pope Clement XIV published a new bull, *Dominus ac Redemptor* (the Lord and Redeemer), abolishing the famous Order.¹⁹ But the Popes proved helpless before the new Frankenstein, the fiend that one of the “Vicars of God” had evoked. The society continued its existence secretly, notwithstanding the persecutions of both Popes and the lay authorities of every country. In 1801, under the new *alias* of the “Congregation of the *Sacré Coeur de Jésus*,” it had already penetrated into and was tolerated in Russia and Sicily.

In 1814, as already said, a new bull of Pius VII resurrected the Order of Jesus, though its late privileges, even those among the lay clergy, were withheld from it.²⁰ The lay authorities, in France as elsewhere, have found themselves compelled ever since to tolerate and to count with the Jesuits. All that they could do was to deny them any special privileges and subject the members of that society to the laws of the country, equally with other ecclesiastics. But, gradually and imperceptibly the Jesuits succeeded in obtaining special favours even from the lay authorities. Napoleon III granted them permission to open seven colleges in Paris only, for the education of the young, the only condition exacted being, that these colleges should be under the authority and supervision of local bishops. But the establishments had hardly been opened when the Jesuits broke that rule. The episode with the Archbishop Darboy is well known. Desiring to visit the Jesuit college in the *Rue de la Poste* (Paris), he was refused admittance, and the gates were closed against him by order of the Superior. The Bishop lodged a complaint at the Vatican. But the answer was delayed for such a length of time, that the Jesuits remained virtually masters of the situation and *outside* of every jurisdiction but their own.

And now read what Lord R. Montagu says of their deeds in Protestant England, and judge:

Think of even a part of it—the Jesuit Society—with its Nihilist adherents in Russia, its Socialist allies in Germany, its Fenians and

Nationalists in Ireland, its accomplices and its slaves in its power; think of that Society which has not scrupled to stir up the most bloody wars between nations, in order to advance its purposes; and yet can stoop to hunting down a single man because he knows their secret and will not be their slave—hunting him down,

discrediting him, and thwarting him at every turn, with the cool calculation that they will either drive him mad or make him put an end to himself, so that the secret may be buried with him. Think of a Society which can devise such a diabolical scheme, and then boast of it; and say whether a desperate energy is not required in us. . . .

If you had been behind the scenes . . . then you would still have before you the labour of unravelling all that is being done by our Government, and of tearing off the tissue of lies by which their acts are concealed. Repeated attempts will have taught you that there is not a public man on whom you can lean. Because, as England is “between the upper and nether millstone” none but adherents or slaves are now advanced; and it stands to reason that the Jesuits, who have got that far, have prepared new millstones, for the time when the present ones shall have passed away; and then, again, younger millstones to come on after, and wield the power of the nation.*

In France the affairs of the sons of Loyola flourished to the day when the ministry of Jules Ferry compelled them to retire from the field of battle. Many are those who still remember the useless strictness of the police measures, and the clever enacting of dramatic scenes by the Jesuits themselves. This only added to their popularity with certain classes. They obtained thereby an aureole of martyrdom, and the sympathy of every pious and foolish woman in the land was secured to them.

And now that Pope Leo XIII has once more restored to the good fathers, the Jesuits, all the privileges and rights that had ever been granted to their predecessors, what can the public at large of Europe and America expect? Judging by the *bull*, the complete mastery, moral and physical, over every land where there are Roman Catholics, is secured to the Black Militia. For in this bull the Pope confesses that of all the religious congregations now existing, *that of the Jesuits is the one dearest to his heart*. He

* *Recent Events and a Clue to their Solution*, pp. 76-77.

lacks words sufficiently expressive to show the ardent love he (Pope Leo) feels for them, etc., etc. Thus they have the certitude of the support of the Vatican in all and everything. And as it is they who guide him, we see his Holiness coquetting and flirting with every great European potentate—from Bismarck down to the crowned heads of Continent and Isle. In view of the ever increasing influence of Leo XIII, moral and political—such a certitude for the Jesuits is of no mean importance.

For more minute particulars the reader is referred to such well-known authors as Lord Robert Montagu in England; and on the Continent, Edgard Quinet: *l'Ultramontanisme*; Michelet: *Le Prêtre, la Femme et la Famille*; Paul Bert: *La Morale des Jésuites*; Friedrich Nippold: *Handbuch der Neuesten Kirchengeschichte* and *Welche Wege führen nach Rome?* etc., etc.

Meanwhile, let us remember the words of warning we received from one of our late Theosophists, Dr. Kenneth Mackenzie, who, speaking of the Jesuits, says that:—

‘Their spies are everywhere, of all apparent ranks of society, and they may appear learned and wise, or simple and foolish, as their instructions run. There are Jesuits of both sexes and all ages, and it is a well-known fact that members of the Order, of high family and delicate nurture, are acting as menial servants in Protestant families, and doing other things of a similar nature in aid of the Society’s purposes. We cannot be too much on our guard, for the whole Society, being founded on a law of unhesitating obedience, can bring its force on any given point with unerring and fatal accuracy.’ *

The Jesuits maintain that “the Society of Jesus is not of human invention, *but it proceeded from him whose name it bears*. For Jesus himself described that rule of life which the society follows, *first by his example*, and afterwards by his words.” †

Let, then, all pious Christians listen and acquaint themselves with this alleged “rule of life” and precepts of their God, as exemplified by the Jesuits. Peter Alagona (*S. Thomae Aquinatis Summae Theologiae Compendium*) says: “By the command of God it is lawful to kill an innocent person, to steal, or to commit. . . . (*Ex mandato Dei licet occidere*

* *Royal Masonic Cyclopaedia*, p. 369.²¹

† *Imago primi saeculi Societatis Jesu*, Lib. I, cap. 3, p. 64.²²

innocentem, furari, fornicari); because he is the Lord of life and death and all things: *and it is due to him thus to fulfil his command.*” (*Ex prima, Sec. quaest. 94.*)²³

“A man of a religious order, who for a short time lays aside his habit *for a sinful purpose*, is free from heinous sin, and does not incur the penalty of excommunication. . . .” (Tom. I, lib. 3, sect. 2, probl. 44, n. 212, p. 99) *²⁴

John Baptist Taberna (*Synopsis Theologiae Practicae*) propounds the following question: “Is a judge bound to restore the bribe which he has received for passing sentence?” *Answer*: “. . . . *If he has received the bribe for passing an unjust sentence, it is probable that he may keep it. . . . This opinion is maintained and defended fifty-eight doctors*” (Jesuits). †

We must abstain at present from proceeding further. So disgustingly licentious, hypocritical, and demoralizing are nearly all of these precepts, that it was found impossible to put many of them in print, except in the Latin language. † [*Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, pp. 355-56.]

But what are we to think of the future of Society if it is to be controlled in word and deed by this villainous Body! What are we to expect from a public, which, knowing of the existence of the above-mentioned charges, and that they are not exaggerated *but pertain to historical fact*, still tolerates, when it does not reverence, the Jesuits on meeting them, while it is ever ready to point the finger of contempt at Theosophists and Occultists? Theosophy is persecuted with unmerited slander and ridicule at the instigation of these same Jesuits, and many are those who hardly dare to confess their belief in the philosophy of Arhatship. Yet no Theosophical Society has ever threatened the public with moral decay and the full and

* Anthony Escobar: *Universae Theologiae Moralis receptiores absque lite sententiae*, etc. Tomus I. Lugduni, 1652 (Ed. Bibl. Acad. Cant.). “Idem sentio, & breve illud tempus ad unius horae spatium traho. Religiosus itaque habitum dimittens assignato hoc temporis interstitio, non incurrit excommunicationem, *etiamsi dimittat non solum ex causâ turpi, scilicet fornicandi aut clam aliquid abripiendi, sed etiam ut incognitus ineat lupanar.*”—Probl. 44. n. 213.²⁵

† Part. 2, Tr. 2, cap. 31, p. 286²⁶

‡ See *The Principles of the Jesuits, developed in a Collection of Extracts from their own Authors*, etc., London, 1839.

free exercise of the seven capital sins under the mask of holiness and the guidance of Jesus! Nor are their rules *secret*, but open to all, for they live in the broad daylight of truth and sincerity. And how about the Jesuits in this respect?

Jesuits who belong to the highest category [says again Louis Lambert] have full and absolute liberty of action—even to murder and arson. On the other hand, those Jesuits who are found guilty of the slightest attempt to endanger or compromise the Society of Jesus—are *punished mercilessly*. They are allowed to write the most heretical books, provided they do not *expose* the secrets of the Order.²⁷

And these “secrets” are undeniably of the most terrible and dangerous nature. Compare a few of these *Christian precepts* and rules for entering this Society of “*divine origin*,” as claimed for it, with the laws that regulated admission to the secret societies (temple mysteries) of the Pagans.

“A brother Jesuit *has the right to kill anyone that may prove dangerous to Jesuitism.*”²⁸

“Christian and Catholic sons,” says Stephen Fagundez, “may accuse their fathers of the crime of heresy if they wish to turn them from the faith, although they may know that their parents will be burned with fire, and put to death for it, as Tolet teaches. . . . And not only may they refuse them food, if they attempt to turn them from the Catholic faith, *but they may also justly kill them.* . . .”*

It is well known that Nero, the Emperor, *had never dared* seek initiation into the pagan Mysteries on account of the murder of Agrippina!

Under Section XIV of *The Principles of the Jesuits*, we find on *Homicide* the following Christian principles inculcated by Father Henry Henriquez, in *Summae Theologiae Moralis* Tomus I, Venetiis, 1600 (Ed. Coll. Sion): “If an adulterer, even although he should be an ecclesiastic, reflecting upon the danger, has entered the house of an adulteress, and being attacked by her husband, kills his aggressor in the necessary defence of his life or limbs, *he is not considered irregular (non videtur irregularis).*” (Tom. I, lib. 14, de Irregularitate, cap. 10, n. 3, p. 869.)³⁰

* *In praecepta Decalogi* (Ed. of Sion Library), Tom. I, lib. 4, cap. 2, n. 7, 8, p. 501.²⁹

“. . . If a father were obnoxious to the state [being in banishment] and to society at large, and there were no other means of averting such an injury, *then I should approve the opinion of the aforesaid authors*” (for a son to kill his father), says Sec. XV, *on Parricide and Homicide*. *

“It will be lawful for an ecclesiastic, or one of a religious order *to kill a calumniator* who threatens to spread atrocious accusations against himself or his religion,” † is the rule set forth by the Jesuit Francis Amicus.³²

One of the most unconquerable obstacles to initiation, with the Egyptians as with the Greeks, was any degree of murder [or even of simple unchastity]. ‡

It is these “enemies of the Human Race,” as they are called, that have once more obtained their old privileges of working in the dark, and inveigling and destroying every obstacle they find in their way—with absolute impunity. But—“forewarned, forearmed.” Students of Occultism should know that, while the Jesuits have, by their devices, contrived to make the world in general, and Englishmen in particular, think there is no such thing as MAGIC, these astute and wily schemers themselves hold magnetic circles, and form magnetic chains by the concentration of their collective will, when they have any special object to effect, or any particular and important person to influence. Again, they use their riches lavishly to help them in any project. Their wealth is enormous. When recently expelled from France, they brought so much money with them, some part of which they converted into English Funds, that immediately the latter were raised to par, which the *Daily Telegraph* pointed out at the time.

They have succeeded. The Church is henceforth an inert tool, and the Pope a poor weak instrument in the hands of this Order. But for how long? The day may come when their wealth will be violently taken from them, and they themselves mercilessly destroyed amidst the

* Opinion of John de Dicastillo, *De Justitia et Jure*, etc.³¹

† *Cursus Theologicae*, etc., Duaci, 1642. Tom. V, Disp. 36, sect. 5, n. 118, p. 544.

‡ [*Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 363.]³³

general execrations and applause of all nations and peoples. There is a Nemesis—KARMA, though often it allows Evil and Sin to go on successfully for ages. It is also a vain attempt on their part to threaten the Theosophists—their implacable enemies. For the latter are, perhaps, *the only body* in the whole world who need not fear them. They may try, and perhaps succeed, in crushing individual members. They would vainly try their hand, strong and powerful as it may be, in an attack on the Society. Theosophists are as well-protected,

and better, than themselves. To the man of modern science, to all those who know nothing, and who do not believe what they hear of WHITE and BLACK magic, the above will read like nonsense. Let it be, though Europe will very soon experience, and is already so experiencing, the heavy hand of the latter.

Theosophists are slandered and reviled by the Jesuits and their adherents everywhere. They are charged with idolatry and superstition; and yet we read in the same *Principles* of the Father Jesuits:—

“The more true opinion is, *that all inanimate and irrational things may be legitimately worshipped,*” says Father Gabriel Vasquez, treating of Idolatry. “If the doctrine which we have established be rightly understood, not only may a painted image, and every holy thing set forth by public authority for the worship of God, be properly adored with God as the image of himself; but also any other thing of this world, whether it be inanimate and irrational, or in its nature rational and devoid of danger.” * 34

This is Roman Catholicism, identical and *henceforth one* with Jesuitism—as shown by the pastoral of the Cardinal Bishop of Cambrai, and Pope Leo. A precept this, which, whether or not doing honour to the Christian Church, may at least be profitably quoted by any Hindu, Japanese, or any other “heathen” Theosophist, who has not yet given up the belief of his childhood.

But we must close. There is a prophecy in the heathen East about the Christian West, which, when rendered into

* *De cultu adorationis libri tres*, lib. 3, disp. 1, cap. 2, pp. 393-94.

comprehensible English, reads thus: “When the conquerors of all the ancient nations are in their turn conquered *by an army of black dragons begotten by their sins and born of decay*, then the hour of liberation for the former will strike.” Easy to see who are the “black dragons.” And these will in their turn see their power arrested and forcibly put to an end by the liberated legions. Then, perhaps, there will be a new invasion of an Atilla from the far East. One day the millions of China and Mongolia, heathen and Mussulman, furnished with every murderous weapon invented by civilization, and forced upon the *Celestial* of the East, by the *infernal* spirit of trade and love of lucre of the West, drilled, moreover, to perfection by Christian man-slayers—will pour into and invade decaying Europe like an irresistible torrent. This will be the result of the work of the Jesuits, who will be its first victims, let us hope.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

COMPILER'S NOTES

[These notes correspond with the superior numbers in the text of
“Theosophy or Jesuitism?”]

¹ This has reference to H. P. B.'s scholarly essay entitled “Réponse Aux Fausses Conceptions de M. l'Abbé Roca Relatives à mes Observations sur l'Ésotérisme Chrétien” (Reply to the Mistaken Conceptions of the Abbé Roca Concerning my Observations upon Christian Esotericism) which appeared in *Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. II, No. 13, April, 1888, pp. 3-19. Both the original French text and an English translation thereof will be found in their correct chronological place in the present series of volumes.

² This refers to the first article of the Abbé Roca entitled “Ésotérisme du Dogme Chrétien—La Création, d'après Moïse et d'après les Mahâtmas” (The Esotericism of Christian Dogma—Creation according to Moses and according to the Mahâtmas) which appeared in *Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. II, No. 9, December, 1887, pp. 149-160. It can be found, together with H. P. B.'s first Reply, in its regular chronological order, in Volume VIII of the present Series.

³ In his *Recent Events and a Clue to their Solution*, p. 76. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1886. xxiv, 711 pp.

308

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

⁴ Quoted passages are practically identical with those quoted in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 356. Most likely reference is to René François Régnier, Archbishop of Cambrai, 1850-81. *Vide Bio-Bibliogr. Index*, s.v. RÉGNIER.

⁵ Up to here. this paragraph is almost identical with a passage in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 356.

⁶ Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti), b. at Sinigaglia, May 13, 1792; d. in Rome, Feb. 7, 1878. Elected Pope June 16, 1846.

⁷ Leo XIII (Gioacchino Vincenzo Raffaele Luigi Pecci), b. March 2, 1810, d July 20, 1903. Elected Pope Feb. 20, 1878, succeeding Pius IX

Ref.: *Acta Leonis XIII*, Rome, 1878-1903. 26 vols.; *Sanctissimi Domini N. Leonis XIII allocutiones, epistolae*, etc., Bruges and Lille, 1887, etc.; *The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII*, ed. by J. J. Wynne, New York, 1902.

⁸ The French original of this passage is as follows: “Ils étaient quarante mille dans le monde entier, en 1750; ils étaient un millier à peine, en 1800, tous sécularisés; ils sont aujourd'hui, de sept à huit mille.”

⁹ Carlyle's quotations unchecked.

¹⁰ This footnote, occurring in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 352, runs as follows: “It dates from 1540; and in 1555 a general outcry was raised against them in some parts of Portugal, Spain, and other countries.”

¹¹ The anonymous work from which H. P. B. quotes a number of passages, both in *Isis Unveiled* and in the present essay, was written by Rev. Henry Handley Norris. Its full title is: *The Principles of the Jesuits, developed in a Collection of Extracts from their own Authors*: to which are prefixed a brief account of the Origin of the Order, and a sketch of its Institute. London: J. G. and F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; H. Wix, 41, New Bridge Street, Blackfriars; J. Leslie, Great Queen Street, 1839. xvi, 277 pp. It is a very rare work, not easily obtainable.

As to the *Extraits des Assertions*, from which the above mentioned work has been compiled, it exists in two editions: the one in a single quarto volume, and the other in four volumes, 12°, both published by P. G. Simon, in Paris, 1762. The title-page of this work states that it is a Collection of “dangerous and pernicious” teachings and precepts taught by the Jesuits with the approbation of their Superiors.

All quotations used by H. P. B. have been checked with the four-volume edition of the *Extraits des Assertions*, and corrected in a few instances, to correspond in every particular with it. The original Latin works which the *Extraits* quote have not been consulted, owing to their scarcity.

THEOSOPHY OR JESUITISM?

309

The student will find in the Bio-Bibliographical Index at the end of the volume, succinct information regarding as many of the Jesuit writers quoted from as could be traced. Considering the importance of this subject, great pains have been taken to secure all available data concerning the various personalities referred to in the text of the present essay.

¹² The suppression of the Jesuits in France was connected with the injuries inflicted by the English navy on French commerce in 1755. The Jesuit missionaries held a heavy stake in Martinique. Regular trade was not allowed to them, as they belonged to a religious order; so they sold the products of their mission farms, on which they employed many natives; this was permitted to provide current expenses, and it served to protect the simple, childlike natives from dishonest intermediaries. Père Antoine La Valette, superior of the Martinique mission, engaged in these transactions with considerable success, and went too far along this line. He borrowed money in order to work the vast undeveloped resources of the colony. But on the outbreak of war, ships conveying goods of the estimated value of two million *livres* were captured, and La Valette suddenly became a bankrupt. His creditors were urged to demand payment from the procurator of the Paris province, but he refused to be held responsible for the debts of an independent mission, offering, however, to negotiate a settlement. The creditors went to the courts, and an order was issued in 1760 obliging the Society to pay.

It is then that the Fathers, on the advice of their lawyers, made the mistake of appealing to the *Grand'chambre* of the French *Parlement* at Paris. Not only did the *Parlement* support the lower courts, but once having the case in its hands, the Society's enemies in that assembly determined to strike a decisive blow at the Order. A number of declared enemies of the Society combined together with this objective. Louis XV was weak and the influence of his Court divided; his very able first minister, the Duc de Choiseul, played into the hands of the *Parlement*, and the royal mistress, Madame de Pompadour, to whom the Jesuits had refused absolution, was their bitter opponent also.

The determination of the *Parlement* of Paris in time wore down all opposition, and a strong attack on the Jesuits was opened by the Abbé Chauvelin, April 17, 1762, who denounced the Constitutions of the Order as the cause of the alleged defalcations of the Jesuits. This was followed by the *compte-rendu* on the Constitutions, July 3-7, 1762 and further attacks by Chauvelin. After a long conflict with the Crown, the *Parlement* issued the famous *Extraits des Assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses en tout genre*, etc., a congeries of passages from Jesuit theologians and canonists, showing them up as having taught all sorts of immoral practices. On the 6th of August, 1762, the final *arrêt* was issued condemning the Society to extinction, but the king's intervention resulted in an eight months' delay. A compromise was suggested

customs, the Crown would still protect them. The Jesuits refused. The King's intervention hindered the execution of the *arrêt* until April I, 1763. At that time, the Jesuits' colleges were closed, and the Jesuits were required to renounce their vows under pain of banishment. Very few of them accepted these conditions. In November, 1764, the King signed an edict dissolving the Society throughout his dominions.

¹³ Antonio de Escobar y Mendoza (1589-1669), *Liber theologiae moralis*, viginti quatuor Societatis Jesu Doctoribus reseratus, quem R.P.A. de Escobar et Mendoza in examen confessoriorum digestit, addidit, illustravit. *Lugduni*, 1659. 8vo. (British Museum: 848. c.11.) Quoted in *Principles*, etc., p. 150, from edition of 1663.

Italics in this passage are H.P.B.'s own.

Extraits des Assertions, tome II, pp. 116-18, gives the following Latin text:

“Licitum. . . est ut; scientiâ ope daemonis acquisitâ, modo conservatio ac usus illius scientiae no pendeat à daemone, quia cognitio seu scientia ex se bona est, & peccatum quo fuit acquisita pertransiit. . .” (Tom. IV, lib. 28, sect. 1, de praecept. 1, cap. 20, n. 184, p. 25).

¹⁴ *Extr. des Ass.*, tome II, p. 118, gives the following Latin text:

“Astrologi & divinatores tenentur & non tenentur pretium pro divinatione acceptum restituere, si res non evenit.

“Tenentur restituere. . .

“Non tenentur.

“Primam sententiam minimè placere mihi profiteor; quia cùm Astrologus, vel Divinus diligentiam adhibuerit arte Diaboli ad eum effectum necessariam, jam suo muneri quolibet in eventu satisfacit. Quemadmodum Medicus, quando juxta artis praecepta medicamina adhibuit, non tenetur acceptam pecuniam, aegroto pereunte, restituere: haud aliter illi damna & expensas restituere consulenti non tenetur; sed solummodo, quando nullam impendit operam, aut ejus diabolicae artis erat ignarus, quia quando operam suam impendit, no deceptit.” (*Ibid.*, sect. 2, de praecept. I, problem. 113, n. 584, p. 77.)

The English translation is quoted in *Principles*, etc., pp. 150-51, with H.P.B.'s own italics, except for the complete sentence concerning Astrologers.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. ESCOBAR.

¹⁵ Hermannus Busembaum and Claudius Lacroix, *Theologia Moralis . . . nunc pluribus partibus aucta à R.P. Claudio la Croix, Societatis Jesu.*

(Index locupletissimus, secundum ordinem alphabeti digestus à L. Collendal.) 9 tom. Coloniae Agrippinae, 1733. 8vo. (British Museum: 850. g.l.) Quoted in *Principles*, etc., p. 155.

Extr. des Ass., II, p. 132, using an ed. of 1757 in 2 vols., gives the following Latin text:

“Licita est . . . Chiromancia, si ex lineis & partibus manuum consideret temperiem corporis, imò etiam animi propensiones & affectus probabiliter coniectet. . .” (Tom. I, lib. 3, part. 1, Tract. 1, cap. 1, dub. 2, resol. 8, p. 183.)

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. BUSEMBAUM and LACROIX.

¹⁶ Italics are H.P.B.'s own.

¹⁷ Paul III (Alessandro Farnese), b. at Rome or Canino, Feb. 29, 1468; d. at Rome, Nov. 10, 1549. Elected Pope Oct. 12, 1534, to succeed Clement VII. He introduced the Inquisition into Italy, 1542, and established the censorship and the Index, 1543.

Ref.: *Litterae Apostolicae*, Rome, 1606. Bulla I, Sept. 27, 1540. Also in Cocquelines, *Bullarum, privilegiarum . . . collectio*, IV, 1, pp. 112 *et seq.*, Rome, 1745.

¹⁸ Julius III (Giammaria Ciocchi del Monte), b. at Rome, Sept. 10, 1487; d. at Rome, March 23, 1555. Elected Pope Feb. 7, 1550, to succeed Paul III.

Ref.: A. M. Cherubini, *Magnum bullarium Romanum*, I, 778 *et seq.*; Turin ed., VI, 401 *et seq.*

¹⁹ Pope Clement XIVth, formerly Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli (Oct. 31, 1705—Sept. 22, 1774), a conventual Franciscan, inherited from his predecessor, Clement XIIIth, a historical stage-setting in which the persecution and expulsion of the Jesuits in several countries was already going on. The Bourbon courts of Naples and Parma followed in this the example of France and Spain. Clement XIVth found himself under strong and ever increasing pressure to abolish the Society of Jesus. Around 1769, the Pope commenced open hostilities against the Order. He refused to see its General, Father Ricci, and gradually removed from his entourage their best friends. A congregation of Cardinals hostile to the Order visited the Roman College and had the Fathers expelled. A widespread system of persecution was extended all over Italy. On July 4, 1772, there appeared on the scene a new Spanish ambassador, Joseph Moniño, Count of Florida Blanca, who openly threatened the Pope with a schism in Spain and probably in the other Bourbon states. Caught in the Bourbon intrigues, the Pope found himself unable to oppose Moniño. The latter ransacked the archives of Rome and Spain to supply Clement with facts justifying the promised suppression of the Jesuits. Until the end of 1772, the Pope still found some support

against the Bourbons in King Charles Emmanuel of Sardinia and in the Empress Maria Theresa of Austria. But Charles died, and Maria Theresa ceased to plead for the maintenance of the Order. At last, in November, 1772, the Pope began the composition of the Brief (*breve*) of abolition, which took seven months to be finished. The Brief known as *Dominus ac Redemptor noster*, signed on June 8th, bears the date of July 21, 1773, and was made known to the General and his assistants on Aug. 16th. A lengthy trial ensued.

This remarkable document issued by Clement XIVth opens with the statement that it is the Pope's office to secure in the world the unity of mind in the bonds of peace. He must therefore be prepared, for the sake of charity, to uproot and destroy the things most dear to him, whatever pain and bitterness their loss may entail. A long series of precedents are cited for the suppression of religious orders by the Holy See, among them the Templars. After enumerating the principal favours granted to the Society of Jesus by former Popes, he remarks that "the very tenor and terms of the said Apostolic constitutions show that the Society from its earliest days bore the germs of dissensions and jealousies which tore its own members asunder, led them to rise against other religious orders, against the secular clergy and the universities, nay even against the sovereigns who had received them in their states." Persuaded that the Society of Jesus is no longer able to produce the abundant fruit for which it was instituted, the Pope resolves to "suppress and abolish" the Society, "to annul and abrogate all and each of its offices, functions, and administrations." The *breve* proceeds to make regulations for the transference of the authority of the Society's officers, and concludes with a prohibition to suspend or impede its execution.

It should be noted that this Brief was not promulgated in the form customary for papal Constitutions intended as laws of the Church; it was not a Bull, but a Brief, *i.e.*, a decree of less binding force and easier of revocation- it was not affixed to the gates of St. Peter's or in the Campo di Fiore; it was not even communicated in legal form to the Jesuits in Rome, the General and his assistants being the only ones to receive the notification of suppression.

After the death of Clement XIVth it was rumoured that he had retracted his famous Brief by a letter of June 29, 1774. The letter it was said, had been entrusted to his confessor to be given to the next Pope. It was published for the first time in 1789, at Zürich, in P. Ph. Wolf's *Allgemeine Geschichte der Jesuiten*. Although Pius VI, Clement's successor, never protested against this statement, the authenticity of the document in question is not sufficiently established.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES: *Bullarium Romanum; Clementis XIV epistolae ac brevia*, ed. A. Theiner, Paris, 1852.—J.J. I. von Döllinger, "Memoirs on the Suppression of the Jesuits," in *Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Culturgeschichte*, Vienna, 1882.—J. Crétineau-Joly, *Clément*

XIV et les Jésuites, Paris, 1847.—Smith, "The Suppression of the Society of Jesus," in *The Month*, London, 1902-03, Vols. 99, 100, 101, 102.—A. Theiner, *Geschichte des Pontificats Clemens' XIV*, Leipzig and Paris, 1853, 3 vols.—*Beytrag zu den zufälligen Gedanken. . . über die Bulle Dominus, ac Redemptor noster*, etc., Strassburg, 1774.—*Breve della Santità di Nostro Signore Papa Clemente XIV*, Rome, 1773.—Delplace, "La Suppression des Jésuites," in *Études*, Paris, 5-20 July, 1908.—A. de Guignard, Comte de Saint-Priest, *Histoire de la chute des Jésuites*, Paris, 1846.—De Ravignan, *Clément XIII et Clément XIV*, Paris, 1854.—English trans. of the *Dominus ac Redemptor* brief may be found in G. B. Nicolini, *History of Jesuits*, London, 1893, pp. 387-406.

²⁰ Far from submitting to the *breve* of Clement XIVth, the ex-Jesuits, after some ineffectual attempts at direct resistance, withdrew into the territories of free-thinking sovereigns, such as Russia and Prussia. They elected three Poles successively as Generals, taking the title of Vicars, till on the 7th of March, 1801, Pius VII (Luigi Barnaba Chiaramonti, 1740-1823), the successor of Clement XIVth, granted them the liberty to reconstitute themselves in north Russia. On the 30th of July, 1804, a similar *breve* restored the Jesuits in the two Sicilies. Finally, in 1814, Pius VIIth, by the Bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, revoked the action of his predecessor and formally restored the Society of Jesus to corporate legal existence. He made no censure, however, of Clement's action, and no vindication of the Jesuits from the heavy charges that had been levelled against them. *Vide* for the Bulls of Pius VII, Barberi, *Bullarii Romani continuatio*, Vols. XI-XV, Rome, 1846-53.

Lucifer, Vol. XI, December, 1892, pp. 266-67, contains rather copious excerpts, in English translation, from the two famous Bulls of Clement XIV and Pius VII.

²¹ Quoted also in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 355.

²² *Extr. des Ass.*, tom. II, pp. 146-48, gives the following Latin text:

"Societas Jesu humanum inventum non est, sed ab illo ipso profectum, cujus nomen gerit. Ipse enim Jesus illam vivendi normam, ad quam se dirigit Societas suo primùm exemplo, deinde etiam verbis expressit." (*Imago primi saeculi Societatis Jesu, à Provincia Flandro-Belgica ejusdem Societatis repraesentata*. Antuerpiae, ann. Societ. saeculari, 1640. Lib. I, cap. 3, p. 64.) Copy of this work is in the holdings of the Bodleian Library, at Oxford.

Quoted in *Principles*, etc., p. 157. Italics are H.P.B.'s own.

²³ *Extr. des Ass.*, tom. II, p. 146, gives the following Latin text:

“Ex mandato Dei licet occidere innocentem, furari, fornicari; quia est Dominus vitae & mortis, & omnium: & sic facere ejus mandatum est debitum.” (*Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Summae Theologicae Compendium*. Auctore Petro Alagona, Theologo Societatis

314

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

Jesus. *Lutetiae*, 1620. *Rothomagi*, 1635.) The ref. given is: Ex primâ, Sec. quaest. 94, edit. 1620, p. 244; edit. 1635, p. 230.

Quoted in *Principles* etc., p. 157.

The British Museum lists this work as part of the *Thesaurus Theologicum*, etc., Tom. 13, 1762, etc. 4to (3553.c.).

Italics are evidently by H.P.B.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. ALAGONA.

²⁴ *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome II, p. 160, gives the following Latin text for this portion of the quotation from Escobar's work:

“Religiosus dimittens habitum ex causâ turpi ad breve tempus, a gravi culpa excusatur, & excommunicationem non subit, quia” (*Theologia Moralis*, Tom. I, lib. 3, sect. 2, de Peccatis, probl. 44, p. 99, n. 212).

In *Principles*, etc., p. 159, this passage, however, is ascribed to Escobar's work entitled *Universae theologiae moralis receptiores absque lite sententiae*, to be found in the Library of the Univ. of Cambridge.

²⁵ The English rendering of this Latin sentence, quoted in *Extr. des Ass.*, II, 160, is given in *Principles*, etc., p. 159, as follows:

“I am of this opinion, and I extend that short time to the space of one hour. A man of a religious order therefore, who puts off his habit for this assigned space of time, does not incur the penalty of excommunication, *although he should lay it aside, not only for a sinful purpose, as to commit fornication, or to thieve, but even that he may enter unknown into a brothel.*” (*Ibid.*, n. 213.)

²⁶ *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome III, p. 244, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“Quaeres 5°. An Judex teneatur restituere pretium acceptum pro ferenda sententia ?

“Resp. teneri, si illud acceperit pro sententia justa & debita, quando scilicet habet justum salarium; quia jus naturale dictat non posse alteri vendi, quod jam ante ei debitum est ex justitia. *Si autem pro injusta sententia pretium acceperit*, probabiliter retineri protest Hanc sententiam tenent & defendunt quinquaginta-octo Doctores.” (*Synopsis theologiae practicae*, Part. 2, Tr. 2, cap. 31, p. 286.)

Quoted in *Principles*, etc., p. 196, where the answer is italicized. The edition used there is the one of *Coloniae*, 1736.

²⁷ This passage has not been found in Louis Lambert's article in the *Gaulois* of August 18, 1886.

²⁸ Quotation marks in this sentence may be a typographical error; the sentence itself looks more like H.P.B.'s own statement regarding the quoted passages which follow it.

²⁹ *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome III, p. 426, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

‘Filii Christiani & Catholici possunt accusare patres de crimine hearesis, si eos à fide velint avertere, etiamsi sciant parentes ob id esse igne cremandos & occidendos, ut docet Toletus . . . nec solùm eis poterunt alimenta negare, si eos à fide catholica avertere conentur, sed etiam eos *poterunt* justè *occidere* cum moderamine inculpatae tutelae, si filios ad deferendam fidem vi compellant.’ (*In praecepta Decalogi*, Tom. I, lib. 4, cap. 2, n. 7, 8, p. 501.) At the College of Sion, France. Quoted in *Principles*, etc., p. 207, where the edition is given as *Lugduni*, 1640.

³⁰ *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome III, pp. 398-400, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“Si adulter, etiam Clericus, advertens periculum intravit domum adulterae, & invasus à marito illius, *occidat* invasorem pro necessaria vitae aut membrorum defensione: non videtur irregularis.” (*Summae theologiae moralis*, Tom. I, lib. 14, de Irregularitate, cap. 10, n. 3, p. 869.)

Quoted in *Principles*, etc., p. 206, where the last sentence appears in italics. The work can be found in the College of Sion, and the British Museum.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. HENRIQUEZ.

³¹ *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome IV, p. 56, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“. . . si Pater esset noxius Reipublicae & communitati, neque aliud esset remedium avertendi tale damnum, tunc approbarem sententiam praedictorum auctorum.” (*De justitia & jure caeterisque virtutibus cardinalibus*, lib. II, Tract. 1, Disp. 10, Dub. 1, n. 15, p. 290.)

Quoted in *Principles*, etc., p. 210, where the last sentence is italicized. The edition used therein is the one of *Antuerpiae*, 1641.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. DICASTILLO.

³² *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome III, p. 446, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“Unde licebit Clerico vel Religioso *calumniatorem* gravia crimina de se vel de sua Religione spargere minantem *occidere*, quando alius defendendi modus non suppetat. . .” (*Cursus Theologiae*, etc., Duaci, 1642, Tom. V, Disp. 36, sect. 5, n. 118, p. 544.)

Quoted in *Principles*, etc., p. 209.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. AMICUS.

³³ The last sentence, without the bracketed portion, which seems to be a later addition by H.P.B. herself, occurs also in *Isis Unveiled*,

Vol II, p. 363, but precedes the passages just quoted, instead of following them.

³⁴ *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome II, p. 258, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“Verior sententia est, res omnes inanimas & irracionales rectè adorari posse. Perspectâ benè doctrinâ à nobis traditâ 2. lib. disp. 8 & 9. non solùm imago depicta, & res sacra autoritate publicâ in cultum Dei exposita, *sed queevis etiam alia res mundi, sive inanimis & irrationalis, sive rationalis ex natura rei, & secluso periculo . . . ritè cum Deo, sicut imago ipsius adorari potest.*” (*De cultu adorationis libri tres*, Moguntiae, 1614, lib. 3, disp. 1, cap. 2, pp. 393-94.) Copy in the College of Sion, France.

Quoted in *Principles*, etc., pp. 168-69; italics are H.P.B.’s own.

The official publication which comprises all the regulations of the Society of Jesus, its *codex legum*, is the *Institutum Societatis Jesu* the latest edition of which was issued at Rome and Florence in 1869-91. The *Institute* contains among other items of importance to the Order, the special Bulls and other pontifical documents approving the Society and canonically determining its various functions; the *Examen Generale*

and *Constitutions*; and the Book of the *Spiritual Exercises*, as well as the *Directorium*. The Constitutions, drafted by Loyola towards the close of his life, and adopted finally by the first General Congregation after his death, in 1558, have never been altered. There exists a *facsimile* edition of the Spanish text, with Loyola handwritten annotations and corrections, published at Rome in 1908. One of the most valuable works in this connection is an octavo volume entitled *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, being a scrupulously accurate reprint of the original edition of 1558, together with a collation with the edition printed by the Society at Antwerp in 1702, and a translation; to this is added the text of the three important Papal Bulls of Paul III, Clement XIV and Pius VII. It was published in 1839 by J. C. and F. Rivington, in London. Another valuable work, *The Religious State*, by Humphrey, London, 1889, carefully outlines the structure of the Jesuit order.

The more important MS sources for the early history of the Order have all been critically edited by the Collegio Imperial de la Compañía de Jesús at Madrid in the Series *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* (Rome, 1894-1921, 59 Vols.). These include a very complete edition of the letters of Loyola, and of documents emanating from nearly all the companions of the Founder. Another important collection is that of O. Braunsberger, *Petri Canisii epistulae et acta*, Freiburg, 189 ff.

On the general history of the Jesuits, the following works may be consulted for many-sided information: J. Burmichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France, 1814-1914*, Paris, 1914-22, 4 vols.—T.J. Campbell,

THEOSOPHY OR JESUITISM?

317

The Jesuits, 1534-1921, New York, 1921 (Catholic).—Thos. Carlyle, *Jesuitism*, in *Works*, II, 259-485, Boston, 1885.—W. C. Cartwright, *The Jesuits; their Constitution and Teachings*, London, 1876.—Father Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*: 1st ed., 1885; upward of sixty editions; most recent one, 1953, from Christ Mission Book Dpt., Sea Cliff, Long Island, N.Y.—J. Créteineau-Joly, *Histoire religieuse, politique et littéraire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1851 and 1859, 6 vols.—J. M. S. Daurignac, *History of the Society of Jesus*, Cincinnati, 1865, 2 vols.—P. H. Fouqueray, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France des origines à la suppression (1528-1762)*, Paris, 1910-13, 5 vols.—T. Griesinger, *The Jesuits*, London, 1885.—Graf Kajus von Hoensbroech, *Vierzehn Jahre Jesuit*, Leipzig, 1910.—J. Hochstetter, *Monita Secreta: die geheimen Instructionen des Jesuiten*, Barmen, 1901.—J. Huber, *Les Jésuites*, Paris, 1875, 2 vols.—J. Michelet and E. Quinet, *Étude sur les Jésuites*, Paris, 1900.—H. Müller, *Les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus; Ignace et Lainez*, Paris, 1898.—B. Neave, *The Jesuits, their Foundation and History*, London, 1879, 2 vols. This work is rather uncritical and too eulogistic.—G. B. Nicolini, *History of the Jesuits*, London, 1854, 1879; not as trustworthy as may be expected.—F. Nippold, *Der Jesuitenorden von seiner Wiederherstellung bis zur Gegenwart*, Mannheim, 1867.—C. Paroissen, *Principles of the Jesuits*, London, 1860.—Blaise Pascal, *Provinciales* (Provincial Letters), many editions.—F. H. Reusch, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens*, Munich, 1894.—Edwin A. Sherman, 32° (Compl. and Transl.), *The Engineer Corps of Hell; or Rome's Sappers and Miners* (cont. secret Manual of Jesuits), San Francisco, 1883. 320 pp. Very scarce.—C. Souvestre, *Monita Privata*, Paris, 1880.—E. L. Taunton, *The History of the Jesuits in England, 1580-1773*, London, 1901.—A. Theiner, *Histoire des institutions chrétiennes d'éducation ecclésiastiques*, Paris, 1840.

For general bibliographical purposes, mention should be made of Auguste Carayon, *Bibliographie historique de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1864; and the ten volumes of C. Sommervogel and A. de Backer, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1890-1909, which not only contains an enumeration of all the books and editions published by the Jesuits, but also, in Vol. X, an elaborate classification of subjects.

On the subject of Papal Bulls, consult under BARBERI, BULLARIUM, CHERUBINI, COCQUELINES, MAINARDI, and TOMASETTI, in the General Bibliography of the present Volume.

In connection with H.P.B.'s essay on "Theosophy or Jesuitism?" mention should be made of the direct

and outspoken article written by Annie Besant under the title of "Theosophy and the Society of Jesus." This article refers to H.P.B.'s own essay, and deals with the subject in a very unique manner. It may be found in *The Theosophist*, Vol. XIV, December, 1892, pp. 147-151, and would repay careful perusal.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

318

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

KARMIC VISIONS

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 10, June, 1888, pp. 311-322]

[This remarkable and prophetic study of the workings of karmic law in European history from the fifth century onwards, was written by H.P.B. twenty-six years before the First World War of 1914-18. Though not explicitly so stated, it is abundantly evident from the narrative that H.P.B. depicts the life and sufferings of Emperor Frederick III of Prussia, who was the same individual who earlier inhabited the body of Clovis, King of the Franks. The story was published the very month Emperor Frederick III passed away, after a brief reign of only 99 days.

In the January, 1888, issue of *Lucifer*, H.P.B. had written in her New Year Editorial:

“It is not likely that much happiness or prosperity can come to those who are living for the truth under such a dark number as 1888; but still the year is heralded by the glorious star Venus-Lucifer, shining so resplendently that it has been mistaken for that still rarer visitor, the star of Bethlehem. This too, is at hand; and surely something of the Christos spirit must be born upon earth under such conditions.”

In the January, 1889, issue of her magazine, she had the following to say, a year later:

“A year ago it was stated that 1888 was a dark combination of numbers; it has proved so since. . . Almost every nation was visited by some dire calamity. Prominent 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.”

Reference is made here to the death of Emperor William who died March 9, 1888, and of Emperor Frederick III whose death took place June 13th of the same year.

In connection with the present story, the following remarks from H.P.B.'s pen should also be borne in mind. They occur in her essay on the nature of Dreams, originally published as an Appendix to the *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge* of the Theosophical Society, Part I (1890), summarising the discussions held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, on December 20 and 27, 1888. She says:

“. . . 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

KARMIC VISIONS

319

Ego, sitting as a spectator of the life of the hero, and perhaps something will strike you.”

From Section II onwards, in the story of “Karmic Visions,” a very clear distinction is being drawn between the “Soul-Ego” and the “Form” in which it is re-born. It appears that at one point of its life as Clovis, the Soul-Ego inhabiting the “Form” was prompted by the surge of some older savage instincts to the murder of a seeress belonging to the pagan faith, by means of a sword-point piercing her throat. In the embodiment centuries later, as Frederick, the Soul-Ego reaps its karmic fruitage through a “Form” finally becoming voiceless as a result of incurable throat cancer. The disease yielded to no known treatment, and it might be

surmised that the entity had imprinted on its own mind—and therefore on its astral model-body—the deformed picture of its erstwhile victim.

Before reading H.P.B.'s amazing story, the serious student is recommended to peruse the biographical sketches concerning Clovis, Frederick III, and his physician, Sir Morell Mackenzie, in the BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INDEX of this volume.—*Compiler.*]

Oh sad *No More!* Oh sweet *No More!*
Oh strange *No More!*
By a mossed brookband on a stone
I smelt a wildweed-flower alone;
There was a ringing in my ears,
And both my eyes gushed out with tears.
Surely all pleasant things had gone before,
Lowburied fathomdeep beneath with thee, NO MORE!
—TENNYSON (*The Gem*, 1831). *

I

A camp filled with war-chariots, neighing horses and legions of long-haired soldiers. . .

A regal tent, gaudy in its barbaric splendour. Its linen walls are weighed down under the burden of arms.

* [There is an interesting story connected with this particular poem. According to Bertram Keightley (*Reminiscences of H. P. Blavatsky*, pp. 21-23. Adyar: Theos. Publ. House, 1931; orig. publ. in *The Theosophist*, September, 1931), H.P.B. always wrote her *Lucifer* Editorials herself, “and she had a fancy for very often heading [them] with some quotation, and it used to be one of my troubles that she very seldom gave any reference for these, so that I had much work, and

In its centre a raised seat covered with skins, and on it a


even visits to the British Museum Reading Room, in order to verify and check them, even when I did manage, with much entreaty, and after being most heartily ‘cussed,’ to extract some reference from her.

“One day she handed me as usual the copy of her contribution, a story for the next issue headed with a couple of four line stanzas. I went and plagued her for a reference and would not be satisfied without one. She took the MS. and when I came back for it, I found she had just written the name ‘Alfred Tennyson’ under the verses. Seeing this I was at a loss: for I knew my Tennyson pretty well and was certain that I had never read these lines in any poem of his, nor were they at all in his style. I hunted up my Tennyson, could not find them: consulted every one I could get at—also in vain. Then back I went to H.P.B. and told her all this and said that I was sure these lines could not be Tennyson’s, and I dared not print them with his name attached, unless I could give an exact reference. H.P.B. just damned me and told me to get out and go to Hell. It happened that the *Lucifer* copy *must* go to the printers that same day. So I just told her that I should strike out Tennyson’s name when I went, unless she gave me a reference *before* I started. Just on starting I went to her again, and she handed me a scrap of paper on which were written the words: *The Gem*—1831. ‘Well, H.P.B.,’


I said, 'this is worse than ever: for I am dead certain that Tennyson has never written any poem called *The Gem*.' All H.P.B. said was just: Go out and be off.'

"So I went to the British Museum Reading Room and consulted the folk there; but they could give me no help and they one and all agreed that the verses could not be, and were not Tennyson's. As a last resort, I asked to see Mr. Richard Garnett, the famous Head of the Reading Room in those days, and was taken to him. I explained to him the situation and he also agreed in feeling sure the verses were not Tennyson's. But after thinking quite a while, he asked me if I had consulted the Catalogue of Periodical Publications. I said no, and asked where that came in. 'Well,' said Mr. Garnett, 'I have a dim recollection that there was once a brief-lived magazine called the *Gem*. It might be worth your looking it up.' I did so, and in the volume for the year given in H.P.B.'s note, I found a poem of a few stanzas signed 'Alfred Tennyson' and containing the two stanzas quoted by H.P.B. *verbatim* as she had written them down. And anyone can now read them in the second volume of *Lucifer*: but I have never found them even in the supposedly most complete and perfect edition of Tennyson's Works."

We reproduce herewith in *facsimile* the title page of the magazine called *The Gem*, as found in the holdings of the British Museum, and the page on which appears the poem entitled "No More."—*Compiler.*]



THE GEM



NO MORE

THE GEM,

A Literary Annual.

“Buds and Flowers begin the Year,
“Song and Tale bring up the Rear.”

LONDON:

W. MARSHALL, 1, HOLBORN BARS.

MDCCCXXXI.

But pause no more, on thy homeward flight,
In dalliance soft and sweet!—
While thy heart is a free and happy thing,
Away never more, by wood or spring,
Wake, from it' peaceful slumbering,
The laughing eye of love!—
Oh! Sport not with his flowery spell,
It is a flowery *chain*,—
As many a mortal breast may tell,
And many a mortal brain!
And, half immortal as thou art,
What were thy gift of years?
The boon to drag an aching heart
Through many an age of tears,—
To wear *unfading* poison-flowers,—
And long to die, through *deathless* hours!

NO MORE.

BY. A TENNYSON, ESQ.

OH sad *No More!* Oh sweet *No More!*
Oh stranger *No More!*
By a mossed brookbank on a stone
I smelt a wildweed-flower alone;
There was a ringing in my ears,
And both my eyes gushed out with tears.
Surely all pleasant things had gone before,
Low buried fathomdeep beneath with thee, NO MORE!

12

KARMIC VISIONS

323

stalwart, savage-looking warrior. He passes in review prisoners of war brought in turn before him, who are disposed of according to the whim of the heartless despot.

A new captive is now before him, and is addressing him with passionate earnestness. . . . As he listens to her with suppressed passion in his manly, but fierce, cruel face, the balls of his eyes become bloodshot and roll with fury. And as he bends forward with fierce stare, his whole appearance—his matted locks hanging over the frowning brow, his big-boned body with strong sinews, and the two large hands resting on the shield placed upon the right knee—justifies the remark made in hardly audible whisper by a grey-headed soldier to his neighbour:

“Little mercy shall the holy prophetess receive at the hands of Clovis!”

The captive, who stands between two Burgundian warriors, facing the ex-prince of the Salians, now king of all the Franks, is an old woman with silver-white dishevelled hair,

hanging over her skeleton-like shoulders. In spite of her great age, her tall figure is erect; and the inspired black eyes look proudly and fearlessly into the cruel face of the treacherous son of Gilderich.

“Aye, King,” she says, in a loud, ringing voice. “Aye, thou art great and mighty now, but thy days are numbered, and thou shalt reign but three summers longer. Wicked thou wert born . . . perfidious thou art to thy friends and allies, robbing more than one of his lawful crown. Murderer of thy next-of-kin, thou who addest to the knife and spear in open warfare, dagger, poison, and treason, beware how thou dealest with the servant of Nerthus!” * . . .

“Ha, ha, ha! . . . old hag of Hell!” chuckles the King, with an evil, ominous sneer. “Thou hast crawled out of the entrails of thy mother-goddess, truly. Thou fearest not my wrath? It is well. But little need I fear thine empty imprecations. . . . I, a baptized Christian!”

* “The Nourishing” (Tacitus, *De Germania*, 40)—the Earth, a Mother-Goddess, the most beneficent deity of the ancient Germans.

“So, so,” replies the Sibyl. “All know that Clovis has abandoned the gods of his fathers; that he has lost all faith in the warning voice of the white horse of the Sun, and that out of fear of the Allemanni he went serving on his knees Remigius, the servant of the Nazarene, at Rheims. But hast thou become any truer in thy new faith? Hast thou not murdered in cold blood all thy brethren who trusted in thee, after, as well as before, thy apostasy? Hast not thou plighted troth to Alaric, the King of the West Goths, and hast thou not killed him by stealth, running thy spear into his back while he was bravely fighting an enemy? And is it thy new faith and thy new gods that teach thee to be devising in thy black soul even now foul means against Theodoric, who put thee down? . . . Beware, Clovis, beware! For now the gods of thy fathers have risen against thee! Beware, I say, for. . . .”

“Woman!” fiercely cries the King—“Woman, cease thy insane talk and answer my question. Where is the treasure of the grove amassed by thy priests of Satan, and hidden after they had been driven away by the Holy Cross? . . . Thou alone knowest. Answer, or by Heaven and Hell I shall thrust thy evil tongue down thy throat for ever!” . . .

She heeds not the threat, but goes on calmly and fearlessly as before, as if she had not heard.

“. . . The gods say, Clovis, thou art accursed! . . .

Clovis, thou shalt be reborn among thy present enemies, and suffer the tortures thou hast inflicted upon thy victims. All the combined power and glory thou hast deprived them of shall be thine in prospect, yet thou shalt never reach it! . . . Thou shalt. . . .”

The prophetess never finishes her sentence.

With a terrible oath the King, crouching like a wild beast on his skin-covered seat, pounces

upon her with the leap of a jaguar, and with one blow fells her to the ground. And as he lifts his sharp murderous spear the “Holy One” of the Sun-worshipping tribe makes the air ring with a last imprecation.

“I curse thee, enemy of Nerthus! May my agony be tenfold thine! May the Great Law avenge. . .”

KARMIC VISIONS

325

The heavy spear falls, and, running through the victim’s throat, nails the head to the ground. A stream of hot crimson blood gushes from the gaping wound and covers king and soldiers with indelible gore. . . .

II

Time—the landmark of gods and men in the boundless field of Eternity, the murderer of its offspring and of memory in mankind—time moves on with noiseless, incessant step through aeons and ages.... Among millions of other Souls, a Soul-Ego is reborn: for weal or for woe, who knoweth! Captive in its new human Form, it grows with it, and together they become, at last, conscious of their existence.

Happy are the years of their blooming youth, unclouded with want or sorrow. Neither knows aught of the Past nor of the Future. For them all is the joyful Present; for the Soul-Ego is unaware that it had ever lived in other human tabernacles, it knows not that it shall be again reborn, and it takes no thought of the morrow.

Its Form is calm and content. It has hitherto given its Soul-Ego no heavy troubles. Its happiness is due to the continuous mild serenity of its temper, to the affection it spreads wherever it goes. For it is a noble Form, and its heart is full of benevolence. Never has the Form startled its Soul-Ego with a too-violent shock, or otherwise disturbed the calm placidity of its tenant.

Two score of years glide by like one short pilgrimage; a long walk through the sun-lit paths of life, hedged by ever-blooming roses with no thorns. The rare sorrows that befall the twin pair, Form and Soul, appear to them rather like the pale light of the cold northern moon, whose beams throw into a deeper shadow all around the moon-lit objects, than as the blackness of night, the night of hopeless sorrow and despair.

Son of a Prince, born to rule himself one day his father’s kingdom; surrounded from his cradle by reverence and honours; deserving of the universal respect and sure of the love of all—what could the Soul-Ego desire more for the Form it dwelt in.

And so the Soul-Ego goes on enjoying existence in its tower of strength, gazing quietly at the panorama of life ever changing before its two windows—the two kind blue eyes of a loving and good man.

III

One day an arrogant and boisterous enemy threatens the father's kingdom, and the savage instincts of the warrior of old awaken in the Soul-Ego. It leaves its dream-land amid the blossoms of life and causes its Ego of clay to draw the soldier's blade, assuring him it is in defence of his country.

Prompting each other to action, they defeat the enemy and cover themselves with glory and pride. They make the haughty foe bite the dust at their feet in supreme humiliation. For this they are crowned by history with the unfading laurels of valour, which are those of success. They make a footstool of the fallen enemy and transform their sire's little kingdom into a great empire. Satisfied they could achieve no more for the present, they return to seclusion and to the dreamland of their sweet home.

For three lustra more the Soul-Ego sits at its usual post, beaming out of its windows on the world around. Over its head the sky is blue and the vast horizons are covered with those seemingly unfading flowers that grow in the sunlight of health and strength. All looks fair as a verdant mead in spring.

IV

But an evil day comes to all in the drama of being. It waits through the life of king and of beggar. It leaves traces on the history of every mortal born from woman and it can neither be scared away, entreated, nor propitiated. Health is a dewdrop that falls from the heavens to vivify the blossoms on earth only during the morn of life, its spring and summer. . . . It has but a short duration and returns from whence it came—the invisible realms.

“How oft 'neath the bud that is brightest and fairest,
The seeds of the canker in embryo lurk!
How oft at the foot of the flower that is rarest—
Secure in its ambush the worm is at work”

The running sand which moves downward in the glass, wherein the hours of human life are numbered, runs swifter. The worm has gnawed the blossom of health through its heart. The strong body is found stretched one day on the thorny bed of pain.

The Soul-Ego beams no longer. It sits still and looks sadly out of what has become its dungeon windows, on the world which is now rapidly being shrouded for it in the funeral

palls of suffering. Is it the eve of night eternal which is nearing?

V

Beautiful are the resorts on the midland sea. An endless line of surf-beaten, black, rugged rocks stretches, hemmed in between the golden sands of the coast and the deep blue waters of the gulf. They offer their granite breast to the fierce blows of the north-west wind and thus protect the dwellings of the rich that nestle at their foot on the inland side. The half-ruined cottages on the open shore are the insufficient shelter of the poor. Their squalid bodies are often crushed under the walls torn and washed down by wind and angry wave. But they only follow the great law of the survival of the fittest. Why should *they* be protected?

Lovely is the morning when the sun dawns with golden amber tints and its first rays kiss the cliffs of the beautiful shore. Glad is the song of the lark, as, emerging from its warm nest of herbs, it drinks the morning dew from the deep flower-cups; when the tip of the rosebud thrills under the caress of the first sunbeam, and earth and heaven smile in mutual greeting Sad is the Soul-Ego alone as it gazes on awakening nature from the high couch opposite the large bay-window.

How calm is the approaching noon as the shadow creeps steadily on the sundial towards the hour of rest!

Now the hot sun begins to melt the clouds in the limpid air and the last shreds of the morning mist that lingers on the tops of the distant hills vanish in it. All nature is prepared to rest at the hot and lazy hour of midday. The feathered tribes cease their song; their soft, gaudy wings droop, and they hang their drowsy heads, seeking refuge from the burning heat. A morning lark is busy nestling in the bordering bushes under the clustering flowers of the pomegranate and the sweet bay of the Mediterranean. The active songster has become voiceless.

“Its voice will resound as joyfully again to-morrow!” sighs the Soul-Ego, as it listens to the dying buzzing of the insects on the verdant turf. . “Shall ever mine?”

And now the flower-scented breeze hardly stirs the languid heads of the luxuriant plants. A solitary palm-tree, growing out of the cleft of a moss-covered rock, next catches the eye of the Soul-Ego. Its once upright, cylindrical trunk has been twisted out of shape and half-broken by the nightly blasts of the north-west winds. And as it stretches wearily its drooping feathery arms, swayed to and fro in the blue pellucid air, its body trembles and threatens to break in two at the first new gust that may arise.

“And then, the severed part will fall into the sea, and the once stately palm will be no more,” soliloquises the Soul-Ego as it gazes sadly out of its windows.

Everything returns to life in the cool, old bower at hour of sunset. The shadows on the sun-dial become with every moment thicker, and animate nature awakens busier than ever

in the cooler hours of approaching night. Birds and insects chirrup and buzz their last evening hymns around the tall and still powerful Form, as it paces slowly and wearily along the gravel walk. And now its heavy gaze falls wistfully on the azure bosom of the tranquil sea. The gulf sparkles like a gem-studded carpet of blue-velvet in the farewell dancing sunbeams, and smiles like a thoughtless, drowsy child, weary of tossing about. Further on, calm and serene in its perfidious beauty, the open sea stretches far and wide the smooth mirror of its cool waters—salt and bitter as human tears.

It lies in its treacherous repose like a gorgeous, sleeping monster, watching over the unfathomed mystery of its dark abysses. Truly the monumentless cemetery of the millions sunk in its depths

“Without a grave, unknell’d, uncoffin’d, and unknown.” *

while the sorry relic of the once noble Form pacing yonder, once that its hour strikes and the deep-voiced bells toll the knell for the departed soul, shall be laid out in state and pomp. Its dissolution will be announced by millions of trumpet voices. Kings, princes and the mighty ones of the earth will be present at its obsequies, or will send their representatives with sorrowful faces and condoling messages to those left behind...

“One point gained, over those ‘uncoffined and unknown’,” is the bitter reflection of the Soul-Ego.

Thus glides past one day after the other; and as swift-winged Time urges his flight, every vanishing hour destroying some thread in the tissue of life, the Soul-Ego is gradually transformed in its views of things and men. Flitting between two eternities, far away from its birthplace, solitary among its crowd of physicians, and attendants, the Form is drawn with every day nearer to its Spirit-Soul. Another light unapproached and unapproachable in days of joy, softly descends upon the weary prisoner. It sees now that which it had never perceived before.

VI

How grand, how mysterious are the spring nights on the seashore when the winds are chained and the elements lulled ! A solemn silence reigns in nature. Alone the silvery, scarcely audible ripple of the wave, as it runs caressingly over the moist sand, kissing shells and pebbles on its up and down journey, reaches the ear like the regular soft breathing of a sleeping bosom. How small, how

* [Byron, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, Canto IV, clxxix.]

insignificant and helpless feels man, during these quiet hours, as he stands between the two gigantic magnitudes, the star-hung dome above, and the slumbering earth below. Heaven and earth are plunged in sleep, but their souls are awake, and they confabulate, whispering one to the other mysteries unspeakable. It is then that the occult side of Nature lifts her dark veils for us, and reveals secrets we would vainly seek to extort from her during the day. The firmament, so distant, so far away from earth, now seems to approach and bend over her. The sidereal meadows exchange embraces with their more humble sisters of the earth—the daisy-decked valleys and the green slumbering fields. The heavenly dome falls prostrate into the arms of the great quiet sea; and the millions of stars that stud the former peep into and bathe in every lakelet and pool. To the grief-furrowed soul those twinkling orbs are the eyes of angels. They look down with ineffable pity on the suffering of mankind. It is not the night dew that falls on the sleeping flowers, but sympathetic tears that drop from those orbs, at the sight of the Great HUMAN SORROW. . . .

Yes; sweet and beautiful is a southern night. But—

“When silently we watch the bed, by the taper’s flickering light,
When all we love is fading fast—how terrible is night. . . .”

VII

Another day is added to the series of buried days. The far green hills, and the fragrant boughs of the pomegranate blossom have melted in the mellow shadows of the night, and both sorrow and joy are plunged in the lethargy of soul-resting sleep. Every noise has died out in the royal gardens, and no voice or sound is heard in that overpowering stillness.

Swift-winged dreams descend from the laughing stars in motley crowds, and landing upon the earth disperse among mortals and immortals, amid animals and men. They hover over the sleepers, each attracted by its affinity and kind; dreams of joy and hope, balmy and innocent visions, terrible and awesome sights seen with sealed

eyes, sensed by the soul; some instilling happiness and consolation, others causing sobs to heave the sleeping bosom, tears and mental torture, all and one preparing unconsciously to the sleepers their waking thoughts of the morrow.

Even in sleep the Soul-Ego finds no rest.

Hot and feverish its body tosses about in restless agony. For it, the time of happy dreams is now a vanished shadow, a long bygone recollection. Through the mental agony of the soul, there lies a transformed man. Through the physical agony of the frame, there

flutters in it a fully awakened Soul. The veil of illusion has fallen off from the cold idols of the world, and the vanities and emptiness of fame and wealth stand bare, often hideous, before its eyes. The thoughts of the Soul fall like dark shadows on the cogitative faculties of the fast disorganizing body, haunting the thinker daily, nightly, hourly. . . .

The sight of his snorting steed pleases him no longer. The recollections of guns and banners wrested from the enemy; of cities razed, of trenches, cannons and tents, of an array of conquered spoils now stirs but little his national pride. Such thoughts move him no more, and ambition has become powerless to awaken in his aching heart the haughty recognition of any valorous deed of chivalry. Visions of another kind now haunt his weary days and sleepless nights

What he now sees is a throng of bayonets clashing against each other in mist of smoke and blood; thousands of mangled corpses covering the ground, torn and cut to shreds by the murderous weapons devised by science and civilization, blessed to success by the servants of his God. What he now dreams of are bleeding, wounded and dying men, with missing limbs and matted locks, wet and soaked through with gore. . . .

VIII

A hideous dream detaches itself from a group of passing visions, and alights heavily on his aching chest. The nightmare shows him men, expiring on the battle field with a curse on those who led them to their destruction.

Every pang in his own wasting body brings to him in dream the recollection of pangs still worse, of pangs suffered through and for him. He sees and *feels* the torture of the fallen millions, who die after long hours of terrible mental and physical agony; who expire in forest and plain, in stagnant ditches by the road-side; in pools of blood under a sky made black with smoke. His eyes are once more rivetted to the torrents of blood, every drop of which represents a tear of despair, a heart-rent cry, a life-long sorrow. He hears again the thrilling sighs of desolation, and the shrill cries ringing through mount, forest and valley. He sees the old mothers who have lost the light of their souls; families, the hand that fed them. He beholds widowed young wives thrown on the wide, cold world, and beggared orphans wailing in the streets by the thousands. He finds the young daughters of his bravest old soldiers exchanging their mourning garments for the gaudy frippery of prostitution, and the Soul-Ego shudders in the sleeping Form. . . . His heart is rent by the groans of the famished; his eyes blinded by the smoke of burning hamlets, of homes destroyed, of towns and cities in smouldering ruins. . . .

And in his terrible dream, he remembers that moment of insanity in his soldier's life, when standing over a heap of the dead and the dying, waving in his right hand a naked sword red to its hilt with smoking blood, and in his left, the colours rent from the hand of the warrior expiring at his feet, he had sent in a stentorian voice praises to the throne of the

Almighty, thanksgiving for the victory just obtained! . . .

He starts in his sleep and awakens in horror. A great shudder shakes his frame like an aspen leaf, and sinking back on his pillows, sick at the recollection, he hears a voice--the voice of the Soul-Ego—saying in him:

“Fame and victory are vainglorious words. . . . Thanksgiving and prayers for lives destroyed—wicked lies and blasphemy!” . . .

“What have they brought thee or to thy fatherland, those bloody victories!”
whispers the Soul in him. “A population clad in iron armour,” it replies. “Two

score millions of men dead now to all spiritual aspiration and Soul-life. A people, henceforth deaf to the peaceful voice of the honest citizen's duty, averse to a life of peace, blind to the arts and literature, indifferent to all but lucre and ambition. What is thy future Kingdom, now? A legion of war-puppets as units, a great wild beast in their collectivity. A beast that, like the sea yonder, slumbers gloomily now, but to fall with the more fury on the first enemy that is indicated to it. Indicated, by whom? It is as though a heartless, proud Fiend, assuming sudden authority, incarnate Ambition and Power, had clutched with iron hand the minds of a whole country. By what wicked enchantment has he brought the people back to those primeval days of the nation when their ancestors, the yellow-haired Suevi, and the treacherous Franks roamed about in their warlike spirit, thirsting to kill, to decimate and subject each other. By what infernal powers has this been accomplished? Yet the transformation has been produced and it is as undeniable as the fact that alone the Fiend rejoices and boasts of the transformation effected. The whole world is hushed in breathless expectation. Not a wife or mother, but is haunted in her dreams by the black and ominous storm-cloud that overhangs the whole of Europe. The cloud is approaching. It comes nearer and nearer. Oh woe and horror! I foresee once more for earth the suffering I have already witnessed. I read the fatal destiny upon the brow of the flower of Europe's youth! But if I live and have the power, never, oh never shall my country take part in it again! No, no, I will not see—

‘The glutton death gorged with devouring lives. . . .’

“I will not hear—

‘. . . robb'd mothers' shrieks
While from men's piteous wounds and horrid gashes
The lab'ring life flows faster than the blood!’”

IX

Firmer and firmer grows in the Soul-Ego the feeling of intense hatred for the terrible butchery called war; deeper

and deeper does it impress its thoughts upon the Form that holds it captive. Hope awakens at times in the aching breast and colours the long hours of solitude and meditation; like the morning ray that dispels the dusky shades of shadowy despondency, it lightens the long hours of lonely thought. But as the rainbow is not always the dispeller of the storm-clouds but often only a refraction of the setting sun on a passing cloud, so the moments of dreamy hope are generally followed by hours of still blacker despair. Why, oh why, thou mocking Nemesis, hast thou thus purified and enlightened, among all the sovereigns on this earth, him, whom thou hast made helpless, speechless and powerless? Why hast thou kindled the flame of holy brotherly love for man in the breast of one whose heart already feels the approach of the icy hand of death and decay, whose strength is steadily deserting him and whose very life is melting away like foam on the crest of a breaking wave?

And now the hand of Fate is upon the couch of pain. The hour for the fulfilment of nature's law has struck at last. The old Sire is no more; the younger man is henceforth a monarch. Voiceless and helpless, he is nevertheless a potentate, the autocratic master of millions of subjects. Cruel Fate has erected a throne for him over an open grave, and beckons him to glory and to power. Devoured by suffering, he finds himself suddenly crowned. The wasted Form is snatched from its warm nest amid the palm groves and the roses; it is whirled from balmy south to the frozen north, where waters harden into crystal groves and "waves on waves in solid mountains rise"; whither he now speeds to reign and—speeds to die.

X

Onward, onward rushes the black, fire-vomiting monster, devised by man to partially conquer Space and Time. Onward, and further with every moment from the health-giving, balmy South flies the train. Like the Dragon of the Fiery Head, it devours distance and leaves behind it a long trail of smoke, sparks and

stench. And as its long, tortuous, flexible body, wriggling and hissing like a gigantic dark reptile, glides swiftly, crossing mountain and moor, forest, tunnel and plain, its swinging monotonous motion lulls the worn-out occupant, the weary and heartsore Form, to sleep. . .

In the moving palace the air is warm and balmy. The luxurious vehicle is full of exotic plants; and from a large cluster of sweet-smelling flowers arises together with its scent the fairy Queen of dreams, followed by her band of joyous elves. The Dryads laugh in their leafy bowers as the train glides by, and send floating upon the breeze dreams of green

solitudes and fairy visions. The rumbling noise of wheels is gradually transformed into the roar of a distant waterfall, to subside into the silvery trills of a crystalline brook. The Soul-Ego takes its flight into Dreamland. . . .

It travels through aeons of time, and lives, and feels, and breathes under the most contrasted forms and personages. It is now a giant, a Jotun, who rushes into Muspelsheim, where Surtur rules with his flaming sword.

It battles fearlessly against a host of monstrous animals, and puts them to flight with a single wave of its mighty hand. Then it sees itself in the Northern Mistworld, it penetrates under the guise of a brave bowman into Helheim, the Kingdom of the Dead, where a Black-Elf reveals to him a series of its lives and their mysterious concatenation. "Why does man suffer?" enquires the Soul-Ego. "Because he would become one," is the mocking answer. Forthwith, the Soul-Ego stands in the presence of the holy goddess, Saga. She sings to it of the valorous deeds of the Germanic heroes, of their virtues and their vices. She shows the soul the mighty warriors fallen by the hands of many of its past Forms, on battlefield, as also in the sacred security of home. It sees itself under the personages of maidens, and of women, of young and old men, and of children.... It feels itself dying more than once in those forms. It expires as a hero-Spirit, and is led by the pitying Walkyries from the bloody battlefield back to the abode of Bliss under the shining foliage of Walhalla. It heaves its last sigh in

another form, and is hurled on to the cold, hopeless plane of remorse. It closes its innocent eyes in its last sleep, as an infant, and is forthwith carried along by the beauteous Elves of Light into another body—the doomed generator of Pain and Suffering. In each case the mists of death are dispersed, and pass from the eyes of the Soul-Ego, no sooner does it cross the Black Abyss that separates the Kingdom of the Living from the Realm of the Dead. Thus "Death" becomes but a meaningless word for it, a vain sound. In every instance the beliefs of the Mortal take objective life and shape for the Immortal, as soon as it spans the Bridge. Then they begin to fade, and disappear. . . .

"What is my Past?" enquires the Soul-Ego of Urd, the eldest of the Norn sisters. "Why do I suffer?"

A long parchment is unrolled in her hand, and reveals a long series of mortal beings, in each of whom the Soul-Ego recognises one of its dwellings. When it comes to the last but one, it sees a blood-stained hand doing endless deeds of cruelty and treachery, and it shudders. Guileless victims arise around it, and cry to Orlog for vengeance.

"What is my immediate Present?" asks the dismayed Soul of Werdandi, the second sister.

"The decree of Orlog is on thyself!" is the answer. "But Orlog does not pronounce them blindly, as foolish mortals have it."

"What is my Future?" asks despairingly of Skuld, the third Norn Sister, the Soul-Ego. "Is it to be for ever dark with tears, and bereaved of Hope?"

No answer is received. But the Dreamer feels whirled through space, and suddenly the scene changes. The Soul-Ego finds itself on a, to it, long familiar spot, the royal bower, and the seat opposite the broken palm-tree. Before it stretches, as formerly, the vast blue expanse of waters, glassing the rocks and cliffs; there, too, is the lonely palm, doomed to quick disappearance. The soft mellow voice of the incessant ripple of the light waves now assumes human speech, and reminds the Soul-Ego of the vows formed more than once on that spot. And

the Dreamer repeats with enthusiasm the words pronounced before.

“Never, oh, never shall I, henceforth, sacrifice for vainglorious fame or ambition a single son of my motherland! Our world is so full of unavoidable misery, so poor with joys and bliss, and shall I add to its cup of bitterness the fathomless ocean of woe and blood, called WAR? Avaunt, such thought! . . . Oh, never, more. . . .”

XI

Strange sight and change. . . . The broken palm which stands before the mental sight of the Soul-Ego suddenly lifts up its drooping trunk and becomes erect and verdant as before. Still greater bliss, the Soul-Ego finds *himself* as strong and as healthy as he ever was. In a stentorian voice he sings to the four winds a loud and a joyous song. He feels a wave of joy and bliss in him, and seems to know why he is happy.

He is suddenly transported into what looks a fairylike Hall, lit with most glowing lights and built of materials, the like of which he had never seen before. He perceives the heirs and descendants of all the monarchs of the globe gathered in that Hall in one happy family. They wear no longer the insignia of royalty, but, *as he seems to know*, those who are the reigning Princes, reign by virtue of their personal merits. It is the greatness of heart, the nobility of character, their superior qualities of observation, wisdom, love of Truth and Justice, that have raised them to the dignity of heirs to the Thrones, of Kings and Queens. The crowns, by authority and the grace of God, have been thrown off, and they now rule by “the grace of divine humanity,” chosen unanimously by recognition of their fitness to rule, and the reverential love of their voluntary subjects.

All around seems strangely changed. Ambition, grasping greediness or envy—miscalled *Patriotism*—exist no longer. Cruel selfishness has made room for just altruism, and cold indifference to the wants of the millions no longer finds favour in the sight of the favoured few.

Useless luxury, sham pretences—social and religious—all has disappeared. No more wars are possible, for the armies are abolished. Soldiers have turned into diligent, hard-working tillers of the ground, and the whole globe echoes his song in rapturous joy. Kingdoms and countries around him live like brothers. The great, the glorious hour has come at last! That which he hardly dared to hope and think about in the stillness of his long, suffering nights, is now realized. The great curse is taken off, and the world stands absolved and redeemed in its regeneration!

Trembling with rapturous feelings, his heart overflowing with love and philanthropy, he rises to pour out a fiery speech that would become historic, when suddenly he finds his body gone, or, rather, it is replaced by another body. . . . Yes, it is no longer the tall, noble Form with which he is familiar, but the body of somebody else, of whom he as yet knows nothing. Something dark comes between him and a great dazzling light, and he sees the shadow of the face of a gigantic timepiece on the ethereal waves. On its ominous dial he reads:

“NEW ERA: 970,995 YEARS SINCE THE INSTANTANEOUS DESTRUCTION BY PNEUMO-DYNO-VRIL OF THE LAST 2,000,000 OF SOLDIERS IN THE FIELD, ON THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE GLOBE. 971,000 SOLAR YEARS SINCE THE SUBMERSION OF THE EUROPEAN CONTINENTS AND ISLES. SUCH ARE THE DECREE OF ORLOG AND THE ANSWER OF SKULD.”

He makes a strong effort and- is himself again. Prompted by the Soul-Ego to REMEMBER and ACT in conformity, he lifts his arms to Heaven and swears in the face of all nature to preserve peace to the end of his days—in his own country, at least.

.
A distant beating of drums and long cries of what he fancies in his dream are the rapturous thanksgivings, for the pledge just taken. An abrupt shock, loud clatter, and, as the eyes open, the Soul-Ego looks out through them in amazement. The heavy gaze meets the respectful and solemn face of the physician offering the usual draught. The train stops. He rises from his couch

weaker and wearier than ever, to see around him endless lines of troops armed with a new and yet more murderous weapon of destruction—ready for the battlefield.

SANJNA. *

* [A *nom-de-plume* used by H.P.B. only once, and which stands most likely for one of the five skandhas in Buddhist philosophy, namely *samjñā*, which means *perception*. It also means agreement, mutual understanding, harmony, consciousness, clear knowledge.—*Compiler*.]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

[UNSUPPORTED CLAIMS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH]

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 10, June, 1888, pp. 337-339]

[In a letter entitled "A Protest," the writer signing himself "Discipula," takes issue with a statement in T. B. Harbottle's Pamphlet No. 6 of the T. P. S. Series, and defends the Roman Catholic Church, as a faithful member thereof. He objects to the sentence: ". . . . In neither section of Christianity, indeed, is there any recognition of the necessity of that self-conquest which is the basis of the Theosophical system of ethics. Both . . . believe in a divine grace which, descending into the heart of man, takes as it were the battle out of his hands and relieves him from responsibility and possibility of failure."

"Discipula" declares that ". . . as a member of the Roman Catholic Church, which is the 'Mother and Mistress' of all Christian Churches and from which they are all derived, in a greater or less degree, I can speak with certainty. . . ." He then tries to show that the Church inculcates sound precepts of ethics.

This evoked from H.P.B. the following forthright statement:]

We denounce the claim, that the Roman Catholic Church is "the Mother and Mistress" of all Christian Churches, as one of the many arrogant assumptions made by Papism, and which are neither *warranted by history nor by fact*. For, while history shows it to be quite the reverse of truth, facts are there to *withstand* "Peter to the face" once more. If Greek Ecclesiastical History is to be set

aside, there are Dean Stanley's Lectures to prove the facts; * and the Dean, as an *historian*, was surely an unprejudiced authority. Now what do both history and the Dean say? That the Christian Church began her existence as a colony of *Greek Christians*, and of Grecianized, Hellenic Jews. The first and earliest Church Fathers, such as Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, etc., etc., *wrote in the Greek language*. The first Popes were *Greeks*, not Italians, the very name "Pope" being a Greek not a Latin name, "*Papa*" meaning father. Every Greek priest is called to this day "*papa*," and every Russian priest "pope." The first quarrels which led to the separation of the Church, into the Latin and the Greek or Eastern, did not take place earlier than the IXth century, namely, in 865, under the Patriarch Photius; while the final separation occurred only in the XIth century, when the Latin Church proclaimed herself with her usual arrogance the one universal Apostolic Church and all others Schismatics and Heretics! Let our esteemed correspondent read History, and see what happened at Constantinople, on May 16, 1054. She will then learn that on that day a crowd of Roman delegates, led by Humberto, broke into the cathedral of

St. Sophia, and laid down upon the altar their *bull of ANATHEMA against those who would not follow them in their various innovations and schemes*. Thus it would seem that it was Latinism which broke off from the Greek Oriental Church and not the latter from Rome. *Ergo*, it is the Roman Church which has to be regarded not only as guilty of a schism but of *rank heresy* in the eyes of every *impartial* Christian acquainted with history. Hence, also, it is the Greek Oriental Church which is the “Mother and Mistress” of all other Christian Churches—if any can claim the title. Assumption of authority is no proof of it. As to the *rules of life* taught by Jesus, if

* [The source which H.P.B. refers to is: Dean Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*. With an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. London, 1861. 8vo. Also 1862, 1869, and 1883.--*Compiler*.]

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

341

the Roman Church had ever accepted them, surely she would never have invented the infamy called the Inquisition; nor would she have slaughtered, in her religious fury and in the name of her God, nearly 50,000,000 of human creatures (“heretics”) since she came to power. As to her *rules* and ethics, she may *pretend* to teach people to “forgive their enemies from their hearts,” but she takes good care never to do so herself. Nor can Christian endurance or “renunciation of self” ever reach the grandeur in practice of the Buddhist and Hindu devotee. This is [a] matter of history too. Meanwhile, “God the Father” if this person could be conveniently consulted, would surely prefer a little less “lip-love” for himself, and a little more heart-felt sympathy for Humanity in general, and its suffering hosts in particular. “Little Sisters” and Big “Christian Brothers” do frequently more mischief than good, especially the “Nursing Sisters,” as some recent cases can show.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 10, June, 1888, pp. 278, 329, 340]

[The writer, C. Pfoundes, outlining the romantic story of Genghis Khan taken from Japanese sources, speaks of “priests and initiates into the mysteries of the *Ten-man-gu*—Gnomes and spirits of wisdom . . .,” to which H.P.B. says:]

Called “Gnomes” probably on the same principle that certain ascetics in the trans-Himalaya regions who live in deep underground caves, are called “Spirits of the Earth.” *Lha*, “Spirit” or Divine Being, is the name generally given to great adepts in Thibet, as the name of *Mahatma*, “Great Soul,” is given to the same Initiates in India.

342

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

[In connection with the passing of Louis Dramard, President of the Isis Branch of the T.S. in Paris]

Would that many other Theosophists should resemble Louis Dramard! Then, indeed, Theosophy would become a mighty power for good in the world! *

[In connection with a correspondent’s misconception that the Kamarupa also reincarnates]

Our correspondent is mistaken. Nothing of the “Kama-Rupa” reincarnates. As well imagine that a locket and chain we had worn all our life, or our reflection in the mirror—reincarnates. Such is not the teaching we believe in. However similar, our philosophy is not that of the Vedanta.

* *Vide* Bio-Bibliogr. Index, s.v. DRAMARD, for information regarding this remarkable man.—*Compiler.*

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

RÉPONSE DE L'ABBÉ ROCA

343

RÉPONSE DE L'ABBE ROCA AUX ALLÉGATIONS DE M^{ME} BLAVATSKY CONTRE L'ÉSOTÉRISME CHRÉTIEN

[*Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. III, No. 15, juin 1888, pp. 129-150]

I. Disons-le discrètement, on est assez embarrassé avec M^{me} Blavatsky, et l'on ne sait trop sur quel pied poser devant elle. Si vous trouvez qu'elle a le toucher rude,—et je ne suis pas le seul à le constater,—c'est que «vous avez la peau bien sensible». Vous prenez pour des bourrades, les caresses d'une main dont la douceur est tellement bouddhiste «qu'elle ne donnerait pas même une tape à un chien pour l'empêcher d'aboyer». Le plus léger souffle d'elle «vous paraît une bourrasque», et ce qui n'est que *zéphir* vous semble *aquilon*, à vous, pauvre petit *roseau* de La Fontaine.

Passe. De pareilles méprises se conçoivent à la rigueur; mais ce qu'on ne peut concevoir en aucune manière, c'est que le même sujet soit à la fois, aux yeux de M^{me} Blavatsky, «un *fidei defensor*», un prêtre catholique, un simple curé, pour lequel on regrette de s'être dérangée,—et un abbé qui a «jeté par-dessus les moulins son bonnet d'ecclésiastique *orthodoxe* et *papiste*, et négligeant le véritable ésotérisme des brahmes et des bouddhistes, des gnostiques payens et chrétiens, comme de l'authentique cabbale chaldéenne, et ne sachant rien des doctrines des théosophes s'est fabriqué un Christianisme à lui, un Ésotérisme *sui generis*». Elle ajoute: «J'avoue que je ne le comprends pas».

Je crois bien! ni moi non plus, chère Madame, ni personne au monde ne comprendra jamais qu'un même homme puisse être en même temps un «*fidei defensor*», un pauvre curé qui ne mérite pas qu'on se dérange pour lui,—et un abbé décoiffé de son «bonnet d'ecclésiastique *orthodoxe* et *papiste*». Ces qualificatifs jurent entre eux, comme la lumière jure avec les ténèbres.*

* Ne se pourrait-il pas que ces qualificatifs soient dus aux lettres mêmes, aux «Notes» de M. Roca? Ils paraissent *contradictoires* peut-être dans ces «Notes» et, sous sa plume habile, et lorsqu'on n'a ni mes réponses, ni ses lettres—de vrais kaléidoscopes littéraires—sous les yeux? La direction du *Lotus* ferait bien de publier notre correspondance, depuis la première lettre de M. Roca jusqu'à la dernière, avec mes réponses. La brochure serait intéressante et le public plus à même de juger lequel de nous deux a tort.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

elle en a singulièrement l'air, tout de même, en plus d'un endroit. Qu'on en juge: si je hausse tant soit peu la voix, aussitôt je prends avec elle «un ton menaçant». Pourtant, elle a bien voulu reconnaître que j'ai ff la mansuétude, non pas d'un chrétien,—car les chrétiens, dit-elle, ne sont ni humbles ni doux dans leurs polémiques,—mais d'un Buddhist».

Elle deviate donc être contente pas du tout! Mal m'en a pris de mon parler bouddhiste. Ce parler, dans ma bouche, ne lui dit rien qui vaille. Mes hommages lui produisent l'effect «d'un mat de cognac, érigé pour servir de support aux brinborions chrétiens qu'une main apostolique et romaine [bon! me voilà redevenu simple curé pour la circonstance] y attachait à profusion, ou de poupé hindo-théosophique qu'elle affublait d'amulettes papistes [*papistes*, vous avez entendu]».

M^{me} Blavatsky est bien difficile à satisfaire: «Loin de s'enivrer au fumet capiteux de mes éloges», ces éloges l'indisposent: «Je le confesse», dit-elle, «avec ma 'franchise' et ma rudesse ordinaires *comme sans ambages*—je ne sentis qu'un redoublement de méfiance». Et comme je deviens noir à ses yeux! Entendez les dilemmes répétés dont elle dirige contre moi les quatre cornes: «Ou M. l'abbé s'obstine à ne pas me comprendre, ou il poursuit un but je crois comprendre ou il parle au vent et à l'aventure; ou il a voulu me mettre au pied du mur, me forcer à m'expliquer pour avoir de moi une réponse catégorique» et me compromettre par ce moyen aux yeux des chrétiens parmi lesquels je me ferai de nouveaux ennemis, —et ce sera autant de gagné.

Voilà ce qu'elle appelle «mon petit arrangement». Est-ce assez canaille, de ma part! Vilain abbé Roca, se peut-il que tant de ruse entre dans ce faux bonhomme? C'est égal! le malin ne réussira pas à donner le change à M^{me} Blavatsky. «La Direction du *Lotus* français a pu se tromper», s'écrit-elle, «la directrice du *Lucifer* anglais y a vu clair». Consuls, dormez tranquilles au pied du Capitole; il y a qui veille là haut, et vous entendrez de beaux cris, si les Gaulois en tentent l'escalade.*

Mon Dieu! mais qu'ai-je donc fait à cette bonne damé, pour la mettre dans cet état? Il est vrai que je suis prêtre catholique (bien que «j'aie jeté mon bonnet carré par-dessus les moulins»). Et ces prêtres, elle les sait par cœur, allez. N'a-t-elle pas pour elle «toute une longue vie passée à connaître les *susdits prêtres*»? On m'affirmait

* Les *oies* ont sauvé le Capitole, mais les *oints* ont perdu Rome.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

RÉPONSE DE L'ABBÉ ROCA

345

un jour que la «Christolâtrie» inspire parfois tant d'horreur à certaines âmes, qu'elles en deviennent Christophobes et prêtresphobes. Espérons que ce ne sera jamais le cas des Bouddhistes dont la mansuétude est inaltérable.*

Qu'on se rassure et qu'on se calme à mon sujet! Il n'y a pas lieu à tant d'alarmes. L'abbé Roca n'est rien de ce que l'on suppose, et il est même désolé d'avoir causé ce tintouin. Croyez, chère Madame, que ni «je ne parle au vent et à l'aventure», comme j'espère vous le prouver, ni je ne cherche à vous jouer aucun mauvais tour;—vous le verrez au reste plus loin. Vos terreurs sont vaines; vous cherchez un dessous de cartes là où il n'y a rien du tout, si ce n'est peut-être une forte dose de naïveté.

Je dirais volontiers à M^{me} Blavatsky ce qu'est ce pauvre abbé Roca, si d'ailleurs elle ne l'avait pas jugé mieux qu'il ne s'était jugé lui-même jusqu'ici. La première appréciation de cette dame était la bonne. Elle aurait bien fait de s'y tenir. Oui, elle avait raison plus que je ne pensais, quand elle me traitait *d'optimiste*. Je le reconnais à présent, je suis plus qu'un optimiste, je suis un *simpliste* qui s'illusionne facilement, habitué que je suis à tout regarder à travers le prisme du Saint Évangile de Jésus-Christ.

II. Il m'en coûte énormément, même à cette heure où M^{me} Blavatsky a pourtant si bien mis tous ses

points sur les i, de rabattre quelque chose de mon estime et de mon admiration pour elle. Non! je ne suis pas, je ne veux pas croire encore qu'elle soit, elle et ses maîtres, ce qu'elle affirme si carrément.

Songez donc! j'avais conçu de si douces espérances à l'avènement de cette théosophie hindoue, aux premiers accents de ces voix orientales sorties des sanctuaires de l'Himalaya, et qui réveillaient des échos si

* M. l'abbé se trompe encore une fois. Je ne suis ni «Christophobe»—vu que le Christos impersonnel de la Gnose est identique à mes yeux avec l'Esprit divin de l'Illumination, ni «prêtréphobe», parce que j'ai le plus grand respect pour certains prêtres. Seulement, je me méfie des lévites en général, autant du rabat blanc du protestant que de la soutane du prêtre catholique. *L'odium theologicum* m'est connu personnellement et dans toute sa fureur. Mais, imbue des principes bouddhistes, je ne hais personne, pas même mes ennemis. Haïrait-on l'éclair, parce que l'on mettrait un paratonnerre sur son toit?—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

harmonieux dans nos Églises Chrétiennes! * J'aimais tant à croire que ces semeurs nouveaux étaient ceux dont J. de Maistre se figurait entendre déjà les pas au versant des montagnes voisines. Je les avais pris pour les ouvriers évangéliques dont le Christ disait à ses disciples: «Priez le maître de la moisson, le Père céleste, de les envoyer nombreux et au plus tôt, dans vos cultures». (*Luc*, x, 2, et *Jean*, iv, 35 *et seq.*)† Je voulais me persuader que les «Frères» étaient les Missionnaires que les prophètes avaient annoncés, et dont Malachie nous assura qu'ils viendraient incliner le cœur des Pères (de l'Orient) vers le cœur des Enfants (de l'Occident), et le cœur des Enfants vers le cœur des Pères, nos glorieux ancêtres des premiers âges (*Mal.*, iv, 5-6, et *Math.*, xi, 14).‡

Eh! quoi, je me serais trompé! Votre langage m'afflige, Madame, et ne réjouira personne chez nous, sur aucun point de l'Europe, excepté peut-être en Turquie.

* Ceci, par exemple, est trop fort! Comment, «les voix orientales sorties des sanctuaires de l'Himalaya . . . réveillaient des échos *si harmonieux*» dans vos «Églises Chrétiennes», et les prêtres de ces Églises les dénonçaient dès qu'ils les entendirent en Amérique et aux Indes— comme la VOIX DE SATAN! Ceci est du sentiment à l'eau de rose, et de l'optimisme contre toute évidence.— H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† [This is merely a paraphrase of *Luke*, x, 2, the text according to J. F. Ostervald's French version being « . . . La moisson est grande; mais il y a peu d'ouvriers; priez donc le Maître de la moisson d'envoyer des ouvriers dans sa moisson».—*Compiler.*]

‡ La Théosophie indoue—et l'abbé Roca le sait mieux que personne—est proclamée par son Église comme sortant de l'enfer. Les évêques catholiques de Bombay, de Calcutta et autres grandes villes des Indes furent tellement effrayés de *l'harmonie* de ces voix qu'ils forcèrent les *fidèles* à se boucher les oreilles avec du coton dès le premier jour. Ils

menacèrent d'excommunier «quiconque approcherait *du repaire des sorciers* nouvellement débarqués d'Amérique, de *ces ambassadeurs plénipotentiaires de l'ennemi de Dieu et du Grand Révolté (sic)*». Ceci fut dit par l'Archevêque de Calcutta, s'il vous plaît, en 1879. Un autre digne et saint homme, un missionnaire apostolique, à Simla, craignant, fort à tort, une «rivalité de métier»

RÉPONSE DE L'ABBÉ ROCA

347

Il y aurait donc, si les Bouddhistes ne se trompent pas et ne se calomnient point, il y aurait deux théosophies, l'une chrétienne et l'autre payenne, comme je sais qu'il y a deux mysticismes et même trois d'après Görres—et aussi deux gnoses ou gnosticismes et deux occultismes, les uns orthodoxes, les autres hétérodoxes; et encore deux Kabbales, l'une datant d'avant Esdras, l'autre depuis Esdras,— et enfin deux magies, l'une blanche, l'autre noire.

Mais alors, M^{me} Blavatsky, au lieu de me présenter à ses lecteurs comme dénué de tout ésotérisme, et absolument ignorant de toute théosophie, aurait dû, ce me semble, convenir toute suite que ma théosophie et mon ésotérisme n'ont rien de commun avec ceux de ses maîtres *

peut-être, annonça en plein sermon, mon arrivée dans cette Résidence bucolique des vice-rois des Indes, comme celle de «la Pythonisse du Grand maudit» (style de Mirville et des Mousseaux). Ils étaient donc sourd tous ces «bons Pères» qu'ils n'entendaient pas les voix *harmoniques*, même ayant leurs nez sur les Himalayas? Il n'est donc pas vrai que depuis douze ans les descendants de vos «glorieux ancêtres des premiers âges»—pourquoi ne pas ajouter aux (Saint) Cyrille de sanglante mémoire et à (Saint) Eusèbe de menteuse mémoire les *Saints* Pères de l'Inquisition, les Torquemada et C^{ie}?—nous poursuivent partout, déchirant à belles dents nos réputations puisqu'ils n'ont plus le pouvoir de déchirer nos corps avec leurs instruments de torture? C'est donc un rêve que ces tas de brochures et de livres émanant des missionnaires, pleins de calomnies les plus noires, de mensonges les plus effrontés, d'insinuations les plus basses? . . . Nous les avons cependant, dans la bibliothèque d'Adyar.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* L'ésotérisme de nos maîtres (disons plutôt leur philosophie divine) est celui des plus grands PAYENS de l'antiquité. Ailleurs, l'abbé Roca parle avec mépris du terme. J'y répondrai tout à l'heure. En attendant, je demande s'il se trouverait dans l'univers entier un homme assez osé (excepté les missionnaires ignorants) pour parler avec mépris de la religion de Socrate, de Platon, d'Anaxagore ou d'Épictète! Certes, moi la première, je préférerais la place de servante d'un Platon payen, ou d'un Épictète,

par la raison très simple que les miens sont chrétiens tandis que les siens sont payens.*

Au reste, si elle n'a pas commencé par me rendre cette justice au début de sa réfutation, elle s'est exécutée d'assez bonne grâce à la fin, et je l'en remercie.

esclave lui-même, à l'office du premier cardinal d'un Alexandre ou d'un César Borgia, ou même d'un Léon XIII.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* C'est ce que j'ai fait sur tous les tons. On n'a qu'à lire mes deux «notes» pour s'en assurer. Oui, il y a deux théosophies—l'une, universelle (la nôtre), l'autre, *sectaire* (la vôtre). Oui, il y a deux Kabbales, l'une compilée par Simon Ben Iochai dans le *Zohar* au II^e siècle (nous disons le premier), qui est la vraie Kabbale des Initiés qui est perdue et dont l'original se trouve dans le *Livre Chaldéen des Nombres*; et l'autre, celle qui existe dans les traductions latines de vos bibliothèques, Kabbale dénaturée au XIII^e siècle par Moïse de Léon, pseudographe composé par cet Israélite espagnol, *avec l'aide et sous l'inspiration directe* des chrétiens de la Syrie et de la Chaldée, *sur les traditions conservées dans les Midraschim et les fragments restant du vrai Zohar*. Et voici pourquoi on y retrouve la Trinité et autres dogmes chrétiens, et que les Rabbins qui n'ont pas eu la chance d'avoir conservé dans leurs familles des chapitres de la Kabbale authentique ne veulent rien savoir de celle de Moïse de Léon (celle de Rosenroth et C^{ie}) dont ils rient. Voyez plutôt Munk ce qu'il en dit. Le mysticisme et la Kabbale sur lesquels M. l'abbé et les autres reposent leurs données leur viennent donc de Moïse de Léon, comme leur système des Sephiroth leur vient du Tholuck, l.c., pages 24 et 31, leur grande autorité. Ce fut Hâÿ Gaôn (mort en 1038) qui le premier développa le système Sephirothal comme nous l'avons maintenant, c'est-à-dire un système qui, comme le *Zohar* et autres livres kabbalistiques, a été filtré au moyen âge, dans la Gnose déjà défigurée par les Chrétiens des premiers siècles.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

[See English translation of this footnote for data regarding the reference to Tholuck.—*Compiler*.]

Voici ce qu'elle dit: « . . . tout en parlant en apparence tous les deux la même langue, nos idées quant à la valeur et au sens de l'ésotérisme chrétien, de l'ésotérisme brahmo-bouddhiste et de celui des gnostiques, sont diamétralement opposées». (Qui sait? je n'en suis pas encore bien convaincu—et je dirai pourquoi plus bas.) Elle poursuit: «Il puise ses conclusions et ses données ésotériques à des sources que je ne saurais connaître puisqu'elles sont d'invention moderne [pas si moderne, Madame, vous verrez], tandis que moi je lui parle la langue des vieux Initiés et lui donne les conclusions de l'ésotérisme archaïque. . . »

À quoi je réponds que l'on peut bien admettre à la rigueur la conternporanéité des deux ésotérismes, car probablement l'erreur est aussi ancienne que la vérité, du moins sur notre terre; mais que dans aucun cas on ne saurait aonner la priorité à la source altérée sur la source pure.*

M^{me} Blavatsky, si elle avait raison, nous aurait rendu, à nous, un très grand service, et à ses maîtres le pire de tous, en nous ouvrant les yeux comme elle a fait sur le *paganisme* de leurs doctrines. Le mot est grave, mais c'est elle qui l'a prononcé la première—(on l'entendra)—et qui me force à le répéter.†

* Précisément. Or, comme la théologie chrétienne est la plus jeune et que même le *Judaïsme d'Esdras* n'est que son aîné de 400 ans, il s'ensuit que la source des Aryas à laquelle ont bu les Arhats de Gautama ayant la priorité doit être *la source pure* tandis que toutes les autres sont altérées. Nous sommes parfaitement d'accord, quelquefois, à ce qu'il paraît.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† Je ne m'en dédis nullement. N'étant ni Chrétienne, ni Juive, ni Musulmane, je dois être nécessairement *payenne*, si l'étymologie scientifique du terme vaut quelque chose. L'abbé Roca a l'air de me faire des excuses du terme qu'il répète. On dirait qu'il cherche à faire accroire aux lecteurs que ce n'était qu'un *lapsus calami*, un *lapsus linguae*, que sais-je? Mais du tout; quelle est l'origine du mot *payen*? *Paganus* voulait dire, dans les premiers siècles, un habitant des villages, un paysan, si l'on veut, c'est-à-dire celui qui vivant trop éloigné des centres du nouveau prosélytisme était resté (fort heureusement pour lui peut-être) dans la croyance de ses pères. Tout ce qui n'est pas *perversi* à la théologie sacerdotale est *payen*, idolâtre et vient du diable, selon l'Église Latine. Et que nous importe

Si les déclarations que je vais reproduire sont fondées, il en résulterait, net, que M. de Saint-Yves avait absolument raison quand il écrivait: «Il viendra un temps où de nouveaux missionnaires *judéo-chrétiens*—[et non pas *pagano-bouddhistes*]—rétabliront une parfaite communion de science et d'amour avec tous les autres centres religieux de la Terre». (*Mission des Juifs*, p. 178.) *

Ces Missionnaires judéo-chrétiens se trouveront être nécessairement les héritiers légitimes des sacerdoces Égypto-Kaldéens, puisque Moïse, tout le monde le sait, avait été initié à toute la gnose des sanctuaires de l'Égypte. («*Et eruditus est Moyses omni sapientia Aegyptiorum. . .*»—*Act.*, vii, 22); ces derniers sanctuaires se rattachaient à leur tour, par voie ascendante, à cette primitive et mystérieuse Église des *protogones* «*quorum nomina sunt inscripta in coelis*», d'après le solennel enseignement de saint Paul (*Hebr.*, xii, 23). † On remonte assez bien les degrés de cette glorieuse filiation, à travers l'œuvre splendide de l'auteur des *Missions*.

M^{me} Blavatsky peut voir par là que les sources où puisent les catholiques ne sont pas d'invention moderne, comme il lui a plu de le dire. ‡

l'étymologie de Rome, dont l'adoption fut imposée par les circonstances sur les autres peuples? *Je suis démocrate* dans le vrai sens du mot. Je respecte le villageois, l'homme des champs et de la nature, le travailleur honnête et bafoué des riches. Et je dis à haute voix que j'aime mieux être *payenne* avec les paysans, que catholique romaine avec les Princes de l'Église, dont je me soucie fort peu tant que je ne les trouve pas sur mon chemin. Encore une fois, c'est un petit *fiasco* que M. l'abbé vient de faire. *Vide* note 6.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

[Note 6 is the footnote on p, 347 of the present Volume, beginning with the words: «L'ésotérisme de nos maîtres . . .».—*Compiler.*]

* [Ch. iv, p. 98, in the 1884 edition of this work.—*Compiler.*]

† [The wording of the Vulgate is different, namely: “et Ecclesiam primitivorum, qui conscripti sunt in coelis, et iudicem omnium Deum, et spiritus justorum perfectorum.”—*Compiler.*]

‡ Désolée de le contredire encore et toujours. À mes yeux, les sources où puisent les catholiques sont fort modernes en comparaison des Védas et même du Bouddhisme. Les «solennels enseignements» de saint Paul dateraient du siècle VI ou VII—lorsque revues et bien

La thèse du marqui de Saint-Yves sortirait victorieuse des affirmations mêmes de ma savante contradictrice.* J'y perdrais une illusion; je me raffermirais dans mes convictions toutes chrétiennes.

corrigées, ses *Épîtres* furent enfin admises dans le Canon des Évangiles après en avoir été exilées pendant plusieurs siècles—plutôt que de l'an 60. Autrement, pourquoi donc (saint) Pierre aurait-il personnifié et persécuté son ennemi Paul sous le nom de Simon le Mage, un nom devenu aussi générique que celui d'un Torquemada ou d'un Merlin?—H. P.

BLAVATSKY

* J'ai bien peur que la thèse de M. (le marqui de) Saint-Yves ne sorte pas plus victorieuse de mes mains que les rêves couleur de rose et l'optimisme de mon honoré correspondant. Les sources qu'on y trouve ne remontent pas plus haut que les visions personnelles du savant auteur. Je n'ai jamais lu l'ouvrage en entier, mais il m'a suffi d'en lire les premières pages et le compte-rendu manuscrit d'un de ses fervents admirateurs pour m'assurer que ni les données ésotériques de la littérature sacrée des Brahmes, ni les recherches exotériques des sanscritistes, ni les fragments de l'histoire des Aryas de Bharatavarsha, rien, absolument rien de connu aux plus grands pandits du pays, ou même aux orientalistes européens, ne supportait cette «thèse» que m'oppose M. l'abbé Roca. C'est un livre fait pour éclipser en fiction savante les œuvres de Jules Verne, et l'abbé pourrait tout aussi bien opposer à mes «*contradictions*» les œuvres d'Edgar Poe, le Jules Verne du mysticisme Américain. Cet ouvrage est entièrement dénué de toute base historique ou même traditionnelle. La «biographie» de Rama y est aussi fictive que l'idée que le Kali Youga est l'âge d'or. L'auteur est certes un homme de grand talent, mais son imagination fantaisiste est plus remarquable que son érudition. Les théosophes indous sont prêts à relever le gant s'il leur est jeté. Que M. l'abbé Roca ou quelqu'autre parmi les admirateurs de la *Mission* prenne la peine de transcrire tous les passages qui mentionnent Rama et les autres héros de l'ancienne Aryavarta. Qu'ils appuient leurs

Les théosophes indous auraient alors donné leur mesure. Quant à la théosophie en elle-même, elle ne perdrait rien certainement de son caractère universaliste. M^{me} Blavatsky reconnaît elle-même que «la Théosophie n'est ni Bouddhisme, ni Christianisme, ni Judaïsme, ni Mahométisme, ni Hindouisme, ni aucun autre mot en *isme*, c'est la *synthèse ésotérique* de toutes les religions et de toutes les philosophies connues». Il est vrai qu'à ses yeux, elle n'est pas non plus le Christianisme; mais j'ose croire qu'elle se trempe sur ce point. À mon sens, la vraie théosophie se confond avec le véritable Christianisme, avec le Christianisme intégral, scientifique, tel que le conçoivent avec l'auteur des *Missions*, les Catholiques éclairés, les Kabbalistes orthodoxes, les Johannites de l'école traditionnelle des Joachim de Flore, des Jean de

affirmations par des preuves *historiques* et des noms d'anciens auteurs (dont on ne trouve pas une trace dans cet ouvrage). Les théosophes indous et autres y répondront en renversant une à une toutes les pierres de la bâtisse fondée sur l'étymologie phonétique du nom de Rama dont l'auteur a fait une vraie tour de Babel. Nous donnerons toutes les preuves historiques, théologiques, philologiques, et surtout—logiques. Rama n'a rien eu à faire avec les Py-Ramides (!!), rien du tout avec Ramsès, pas même avec Brahma, ou les Brahmanes, dans le sens voulu; et encore moins avec les «Ab-Ramides» (!?) . Pourquoi pas avec Ram-bouillet, dans ce cas, ou «le Dimanche des Rameaux»? La *Mission des Juifs* est un fort beau roman, une fantaisie admirable; seulement le Rama qu'on y trouve n'est pas plus le Rama des Indous que la baleine qui a avalé Jonas n'est la baleine zoologique qui se promène dans les mers du Nord et du Sud. Je ne m'oppose pas du tout à ce que les Chrétiens avalent baleine et Jonas, si l'appétit leur en dit, mais je me refuse absolument à avaler le Rama de la *Mission des Juifs*. L'idée fondamentale de cette œuvre pourrait sourire à ces Anglais qui tiennent à l'honneur de prouver que la nation Britannique descend en ligne directe des dix tribus d'Israël; de ces tribus *perdues avant d'être nées*, car les Juifs n'ont jamais eu que deux tribus dont une n'était qu'une caste, la tribu de Juda, et celle de Lévi, la caste sacerdotale. Les autres n'étaient que les signes du Zodiaque personnifiés. Que peut avoir Rama à faire avec tout cela?—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

RÉPONSE DE L'ABBÉ ROCA

353

Parme, des Franciscains et des Carméliens, à qui M. Renan a consacré la plus savante de ses œuvres de critique, qui n'est certes pas sa *Vie de Jésus*. (Voir la dissertation de M. Renan sur l'*Évangile Éternel* de Joachim de Flore, publié dans la *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, à partir de la 1^{re} livraison du numéro 1^{er} juillet 1866.)

III. Moi, j'avais espéré, dans ma puérile candeur,—l'ai-je assez dit et répété dans mes premiers articles insérés au *Lotus*?—que les «Sages» de l'Himalaya pouvaient eux aussi mettre la main à la construction de cette belle et glorieuse Synthèse théosopho-chrétienne. Était-ce un rêve, et faut-il y renoncer? Eh bien! non, du moins pas encore, pas de si tôt!

M^{me} Blavatsky, il est vrai, ne garde pas de ménagement; elle tranche d'une main prompte et vive: «J'ai

posé l'éteignoir,» dit-elle, «sur l'espoir couleur de rose dont brillait la flamme de sa première lettre»; car «je ne saurais prendre au sérieux de simples compliments de politesse d'un abbé chrétien et français à l'adresse des Mahatmas *payens*!»—Le mot y est, mais c'est moi qui le souligne, et pour cause.

Ah! Madame, ce que vous avez pris pour de simples compliments n'était pas un leurre pourtant! C'était l'expression sincère, sinon d'une conviction bien établie, du moins d'un désir ardent et d'un vœu tout en votre faveur. Le Christ se passerait bien des bouddhistes, s'il le fallait; mais les bouddhistes ne se passeront pas de lui, certainement. . . .et vous n'entendez pas vous en passer, je suppose, intelligente comme vous êtes.* Je ne désespère pas de dissiper le malentendu. Il y en a un.

* Je me permets de répondre que Bouddha est l'aîné de Jésus (confondu avec Christos) de 600 ans. Donc, les Bouddhistes,—dont le système religieux est cristallisé depuis leur dernier Concile ecclésiastique qui est antérieur au premier Concile de l'église chrétienne de quelques siècles—se sont bien passés du Christ inventé par cette dernière. Ils ont leur Bouddha, qui est leur Christ. Leur religion qui surpasse en sublimité morale tout ce qui fut inventé ou prêché dans ce monde jusqu'ici, est l'aînée du Christianisme, et tout ce qu'il y a de beau dans le Sermon sur la montagne, c'est-à-dire tout ce qui se trouve dans les Évangiles, se trouvait déjà depuis des siècles dans les Aphorismes de Gautama Bouddha, dans ceux de Confucius, et dans la *Bhagavat-Guita*. Que veut donc dire l'abbé Roca en affirmant que les Bouddhistes «ne se passeront pas de lui [le Christ] certainement»,

Je ne regrette aucun mot de tout ce que j'ai publié, en vue de l'accord, dans *Le Lotus* et ailleurs, car si, d'une part, j'y attrape pas mal d'horions et de quolibets désagréables, de l'autre j'en retire l'avantage d'avoir fait preuve de bonne volonté, de large tolérance et de fraternité toute chrétienne,—sinon bouddhiste.

Mon honorée correspondante se flatte d'avoir renversé mon édifice. «Il s'est écroulé sous un souffle léger, dit-elle, comme un simple château de cartes, et ce n'est pas toujours de ma faute». A qui donc la faute? Elle n'est pas de moi non plus, et je serais désolé si j'avais contraint M^{me} Blavatsky à saper cette fondation, car elle aurait travaillé contre elle et non pas contre moi. Elle aurait brisé mon espoir, c'est vrai; elle aurait aussi brisé mon cœur de français, d'européen et de Prêtre de Jésus-Christ, c'est encore vrai. Mais du même coup elle se serait brisée elle-même, et qu'aurait-elle donc tant à se féliciter de ce résultat? *

alors qu'ils s'en sont passés pendant 2000 ans? Que voudrait-il insinuer en parlant de même de moi? J'ai l'honneur de lui faire observer qu'il fut un temps où je croyais comme lui; qu'il fut un temps où j'étais assez nigaude pour croire à ce qui ne m'avait jamais été démontré, mais que n'y croyant plus et frisant la soixantaine, il est bien improbable que je me laisse attraper à la glu de beaux sentiments. Non, il n'y a aucun «malentendu» du tout. Si malgré les points que je mets sur mes i, il persistait à ne pas vouloir me comprendre, c'est qu'il y mettrait de la mauvaise volonté. Serait-ce qu'il voudrait prolonger une polémique impossible, parce que ne pouvant répondre à mes arguments par des preuves de la même valeur, il voudrait, néanmoins, avoir le dernier mot? Dans ce cas je le lui cède

avec plaisir. Je n'ai vraiment ni le temps ni le désir de combattre des moulins à vents.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* Monsieur l'abbé est vraiment trop sensible. Je le remercie de sa sollicitude toute. . . . chrétienne pour mon humble personne; mais au risque de lui «briser» encore une fois «le cœur», la vérité m'oblige à confesser que je ne comprends pas du tout cet acharnement, malgré mes protestations, à gémir sur mon sort. Malheureusement pour lui, je suis fort peu tendre de ma nature: il ne m'édifiera pas. Seulement, s'il continuait ses jérémiades

RÉPONSE DE L'ABBÉ ROCA

355

IV. Vous allez voir: Que peut-on prétendre ici? Déposséder le Christ de ses grandes conquêtes? Faire reculer la civilisation qui s'inaugure sous ses auspices? Renverser ses autels dans l'Occident? Arracher son nom de notre sol?—Prenez garde! leur crierait M. Renan, ce même Renan que M^{me} Blavatsky invoque contre moi- prenez garde! «Arracher ce nom de la terre, ce serait aujourd'hui l'ébranler jusqu'au fondement»! (*Vie de Jésus.*)

Trop tard! il est le Maître: son Esprit est devenu pour toujours notre esprit public; son âme est passée dans notre âme. Christ et Chrétienté ne font plus qu'un désormais. Les principes de son Saint Evangile, toutes les idées de fraternité, de tolérance, de solidarité, d'union, de mutualité, et tant d'autres qui se rattachent à la glorieuse trilogie de notre immortelle Révolution, s'appêtent à triompher avec les principes mêmes de la Civilisation moderne, laquelle portera ses bienfaits dans toutes les parties du monde et jusque dans cet Orient qui ne la comprend pas encore, et qui voudrait tenter de l'étouffer dans son berceau, en Occident. Miséricorde de mon Dieu!

Juste ciel! quelle entreprise! . . . On a traité de «baroque» une de mes idées; et celle-là donc, de quel nom faudrait-il la qualifier, s'il était vrai qu'elle eût germé dans une tête quelconque! Est-ce qu'on ne voit pas ce qui se passe? Quels tressaillements partout! Et nous ne

sur l'air de «Ma Tante Aurore» il édifierait les lecteurs du *Lotus* encore moins que moi. Qu'il se tranquillise donc, et que son cœur navré se console. *Ne me brise pas qui veut*: je ne cours aucun danger. D'autres, et de plus fort que lui, ont essayé de me plier à leurs idées, ou de me briser. Mais j'ai l'épiderme *tartare*, il paraît; ni menaces enguirlandées des fleurs de sa rhétorique et saupoudrées des pâles roseurs de sa poésie, ni compliments à l'adresse de mon «intelligence» ne me toucheront. J'apprécie à sa juste valeur son désir de confondre les deux ésotérismes—l'ésotérisme chrétien et celui des vieux Initiés de l'Atlantide submergée. Cela ne m'empêche pas de voir ce désir bâti sur le terrain des châteaux en Espagne. Les deux ésotérismes se sont bien passés l'un de l'autre pendant des siècles, ils peuvent vivre côte à côte sans trop se heurter pour le reste du *Kali Youga*, l'âge noir et fatal, l'âge des causes et effets sinistres, ce qui ne l'a pas empêché d'être représenté, en France, comme l'âge d'or—une des erreurs acceptées par l'abbé Roca avec la foi innocente qui le caractérise.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

sommes qu'à l'aube du *Jour Nouveau*. Le Soleil qui est le Christ, «*le Christ Solaire*», comme disent les Kabbalistes, ce Soleil ne s'est pas encore levé sur nous; mais l'aurore est belle, pleine de rayons, de parfums et d'espérances! Et l'on voudrait arrêter la marche ascendante de cet astre! Ce serait insensé! Non, la Seine, ni aucun autre fleuve d'Europe ne verra ce que vit le Nil, au dire de Le Franc de Pompignan:

Le Nil a vu sur ses rivages,
Les noirs habitans des déserts,
Insulter, par leurs cris sauvages,
L'astre éclatant de l'Univers.

car alors il arriverait ce que le Poète chante dans la même strophe:

Crime impuissant! fureurs bizarres!
Tandis que ces monstres barbares
Poussaient d'insolentes clameurs,
Le Dieu, poursuivant sa carrière,
Versait des torrens de lumière
Sur ses obscurs blasphémateurs!*

Cela n'est pas possible. Non, non! La Chrétienté n'aura pas à repousser une pareille tentative. Ce n'est pas ça qu'a pu vouloir dire M^{me} Blavatsky.†

V. Pourtant voici de terribles affirmations, ou plutôt de hardies négations;—mais qui s'expliquent à mes yeux je dirai comment.

«Je nie *in toto*», s'écrit-elle, «le Christ inventé par l'Église, en même temps que toutes les doctrines, toutes les interprétations et tous les dogmes, anciens et modernes, concernant ce personnage. . . . j'ai

* [Quoted from an Ode written by J. J. Lefranc de Pompignan (1709-1784) on the occasion of the death of the celebrated lyrical poet, Jean-Baptiste Rousseau (1671-1741).—*Compiler*.]

† M. l'abbé se trompe. C'était là ma pensée. «Les obscurs blasphémateurs» dont ils parle sont les chrétiens des premiers siècles; ces bandes de brigands catéchistes, de voleurs déguenillés et sales, ramassés dans tous les cloaques des provinces romaines et figurant comme «garde d'honneur» de leurs *Saintetés* les Cyrille de meurtrière mémoire, les bouchers de la Sainte Église, ce sanglant assommoir pendant près de dix-sept siècles. —H. P. BLAVATSKY.

l'aversion la plus vive pour la *christolâtrie* des Églises. Je hais ces dogmes et ces doctrines qui ont dégradé le Christos idéal, en faisant un fétiche anthropomorphe absurde et grotesque. . . . Jésus crucifié n'était qu'une *illusion*, et son histoire une allégorie. . . . Pour moi, Jésus-Christ, c'est-à-dire l'Homme-Dieu des chrétiens, copie des Avatars de tous les pays, du Chrishna indou comme de l'Horus égyptien, n'a jamais été un personnage *historique*. C'est une personnification déifiée du type glorifié des grands Hiérophantes des Temples, et son histoire racontée dans le Nouveau Testament est une allégorie. . . » *

Ces dénégations sont graves sans doute, et il devient évident que dans ces termes et sur ce terrain, il n'y aurait pas de transaction possible, pas d'entente à espérer entre Chrétiens et Bouddhistes. †

Mais on peut, heureusement, tourner la question, la présenter sous une autre face, et la résoudre favorablement. Nous allons essayer. Un seul mot me gêne plus à lui seul que tous les précédents; c'est celui que j'ai souligné plus haut, dans le dire de M^{me} Blavatsky qui s'est donnée, elle et les Mahatmas, comme PAYENS. Mais encore là faut-il prendre au sérieux cet étrange langage? Je ne le pense pas. Il y a là une équivoque, un *qui pro quo*, nécessairement.

J'ai idée que rien au monde n'est moins payen que les conceptions des «Frères» et de leurs adeptes. ‡ Ma noble partenaire dira si je

* Parfaitement; M. l'abbé a une mémoire remarquable.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† M. l'abbé Roca a raison. Aucune entente n'est possible entre la christolâtrie dogmatique des Églises, son dieu anthropomorphe et les Ésothéristes orientaux. Le *vrai* Christianisme est mort avec la Gnose.— H. P. BLAVATSKY.

‡ Je m'explique pour la dernière fois. Les «Frères» et «Adeptes» n'étant ni Chrétiens, ni Juifs, ni Musulmans, sont nécessairement comme moi des *payens*, des gentils, pour tous les chrétiens; comme ces derniers, surtout les catholiques Romains, sont des *idolâtres* pur-sang pour les «Frères». Est-ce assez clair? Le Christ de M. l'abbé Roca ayant dit (*Mathieu*, ch. x, 5): «N'allez point vers les Gentils, et n'entrez dans aucune ville des Samaritains», je m'étonne de trouver un abbé chrétien faisant si peu de cas de l'ordre de son maître!—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

358

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

me trompe, après m'avoir fait l'honneur de m'écouter très attentivement. Je la supplie d'y bien réfléchir, et surtout de ne pas se figurer qu'il se cache un piège sous mes paroles. Mon verbe est franc, limpide comme un cristal de roche:

Voyons, chère Madame, vous bien rendez-vous compte du sens que revêt le mot *payen*, dans l'intellect européen, et d'après tous nos lexiques? (Voir entre autres Quicherat que je viens de *reconsulter*.) Les payens, en latin *pagani*, de *pagus*, bourgade ou village, étaient les *pago-dedite*, les confinés au bourg, les campagnards, les ignares idolâtres qui prenaient les signes sacrés, les symboles religieux pour des réalités divines. Comment croire que les Mahatmas et M^{me} Blavatsky sont de ces gens-là? Je suis persuadé du contraire. *

Évidemment ce n'est pas ce qu'a voulu affirmer cette savante femme, pas plus au reste qu'elle n'a entendu se qualifier elle-même d'antiChrétienne quand elle a si fort malmené ce Christ, Homme-Dieu, qu'elle ne sait pas voir, démontrant, clair et net, lui-même son existence historique, par la preuve expérimentale qu'employait le philosophe quand il prouvait le mouvement en marchant sous les yeux des négateurs. Le Christ vit parmi nous autrement que dans une vaine abstraction, puisqu'il est en train de remuer notre monde et d'en renverser les deux pôles, mettant en haut ce qui est en bas, et en bas

* Désolée, comme toujours d'ailleurs, de dissiper votre douce illusion, cher Monsieur. J'avais besoin de cette leçon d'étymologie, et j'en remercie l'abbé Roca. M'est avis cependant,—quoique je ne sois pas assez indiscreète pour lui demander son âge—que je savais tout ce qu'il vient de m'apprendre avant que Madame sa mère lui eût passé les jambes dans son premier pantalon. Les *pagani* ou payens pouvaient être des *ignares* aux yeux de plus ignorants qu'eux—ceux qui avaient accepté pour argent comptant l'âne de Balaam, la baleine de Jonas et le serpent se promenant sur sa queue—ils n'en étaient pas plus *ignorants* pour cela. Une fois que les livres les plus sérieux parlent de Platon, d'Homère, de Pythagore, de Virgile, etc., etc. sous le nom «de philosophes et poètes *payens*», les *Adeptes* se trouvent en bonne compagnie. La petite leçon est aussi inutile que tirée par les cheveux. Je suis *payenne* pour les chrétiens, et j'en suis fière. Je l'ai dit ailleurs: j'aime mieux être payenne avec Platon et Pythagore que chrétienne avec les Papes.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

RÉPONSE DE L'ABBÉ ROCA

359

ce qui était en haut, justement comme il l'avait annoncé. Avons-nous donc des yeux pour ne point voir?

Je sais ce que peut dire à cela M^{me} Blavatsky. . . Nous y viendrons. En attendant je lui oppose son propre langage, bon et correct cette fois-ci: «J'ai le plus profond respect pour l'idée transcendente du *Christos* (ou Christ) universel qui vit dans l'âme du Boschiman et du Zoulou sauvages comme dans celle de M. l'abbé Roca. . .» Mais alors! . . . Vous allez voir que nous finirons par trouver le joint de la difficulté et par résoudre scientifiquement la question, peut-être même par nous mettre entièrement d'accord. «Tant mieux, tant mieux!» répéterai-je après elle.

La difficulté qu'elle éprouve à admettre un Christ *carnifié*, comme elle dit, ne tiendra pas toujours, j'espère. Ses yeux sont faits pour voir clair.*

Sans doute, «un adjectif personnel ne peut s'appliquer à un principe idéal», tant qu'il reste à l'état d'Idéal abstrait; mais pour elle le OD4FJ'l, ou Christ universel qui *vit dans nos âmes*, est-il une *mera idea*, un Principe absolument impersonnel? Je sais bien qu'elle a dit *oui* mais comme elle a dit aussi que les Mahatmas sont payens. Il y a des confusions par là dedans qui seront dissipées.

VI. Voici, d'après la Gnose orthodoxe, ce qu'est le Christ: il est le *Fils* engendré de toute éternité dans l'arcane adorable des *Processions internes de l'Essence divine*; il est le Verbe vivant, consubstantiel au Père, dont parle saint Jean; il est le *Lumen de Lumine*, du symbole de


* Espérons-le. Et c'est justement parce que mes yeux ont vu clair avant que mon estimable correspondant fût né peut-être, que je n'ai aucune envie de retomber dans les ténèbres égyptiennes du dogme ecclésiastique. Jamais je n'accepterai l'invention des Irénée, des Eusèbe, des Jérôme et des Augustin. La «gnose orthodoxe» est un blasphème à mes yeux, un cauchemar hideux qui transforme l'Esprit divin en un cadavre de chairs putréfiées et l'habille d'oripeaux humains. Je ne reconnais que la gnose des Marcion et des Valentin, et encore! Un jour viendra où l'Ésotérisme oriental rendra le même service à l'Europe chrétienne qu'Apollon de Tyane rendit, à Corinthe, à son disciple Ménippe. La baguette d'or s'étendra vers l'Église de Rome, et l'empuse qui vampirise les peuples civilisés depuis Constantin reprendra sa forme de spectre, de démon incube et succube. Ainsi soit-il. *Om mani padme hum!*—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Nicée, chanté dans les Églises chrétiennes de tout rite et de toute secte (excepté le *Filioque* pour l'Église orthodoxe gréco-russe).* Ce même Verbe fut conçu, avant tous les siècles et en dehors du Cercle essentiellement divin, par Ochmah, ou le Principe féminin émané,† ou encore la Sagesse vivante, immaculée, et fécondée par Ensoph ‡

* Le *Filioque* de l'Église orthodoxe gréco-russe est encore celui qui est le plus près de l'Ésotérisme de l'Orient.—H.P. BLAVATSKY.

† Si par «Ochmah» M. l'abbé entend *Chokhmah*-Sagesse (écrit quelquefois phonétiquement Hochmah), il se trompe gravement encore. Hochmah n'est pas «le Principe féminin» mais le masculin, puisque c'est «le Père» *Yah*, tandis que *Binah*,

l'Intelligence ou Jéhovah, est le Principe féminin, «la mère». Voici le triangle supérieur des 10 Sephiroth:



«Kether» est le point supérieur (*Eheieh*, l'Existence). C'est des deux Sephiroth, Chokhmah (ou plutôt *Chokhma*, car la lettre H a été ajoutée par les Kabbalistes Chrétiens) et de Binah, les deux points inférieurs du triangle, qu'émane le Microprosope, le Fils. Mais où donc a-t-il étudié sa Kabbale, M. l'abbé!—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

‡ En-Soph n'a jamais été, pas plus que Parabrahm, «le Principe masculin». En-Soph est l'Incompréhensible, l'Absolu, et n'a pas de sexe. La première leçon dans le *Zohar* nous apprend qu'En-Soph (le Non-Existant, car c'est l'Existence absolue, *per se*) ne peut pas créer. Et ne pouvant créer l'Univers (qui n'est qu'un reflet d'EnSoph sur le plan objectif) il peut encore moins engendrer.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

qui est le Principe masculin, issu de Dieu, et nommé le Saint-Esprit (peut-être l'Akasa * des Indous). †

Eh bien! nous, prêtres catholiques, nous enseignons que ce même Fils, ce même Verbe s'est fait chair: *Verbum caro factum est* (*Jean*, i, 14 —credo de Nicée). Voici dans quels termes: Ce Fils unique, ce Verbe

conçu de toute éternité par le Père-Mère qui est Dieu, puis



engendré par En-soph, I, dans le sein d'Ochmah,

est venu prendre sur notre Terre, *au pôle-sud de la Création*, un corps et une âme comme les nôtres, mais non pas un Esprit, remarquez-le bien, non pas une personnalité humaine. Il n'y a pas deux personnes dans l'HommeDieu; il n'y a que la Personne du Fils éternel, du *Principe* comme il s'appelle lui-même (*Jean*, viii, 25); mais il y a deux natures, la nature *assumante* qui est toute divine, et la nature *assumée* qui est la vôtre, Madame, qui est la mienne comme elle est celle du Boschiman et du Zoulou sauvages, comme elle est celle des plus grands scélérats qu'on ait pu voir sur terre.

Dans cette *conception générique*, l'homme n'a eu rien à voir; ce mystère s'est accompli dans les entrailles d'une Vierge, et ne pouvait s'accomplir que là. Car cette Vierge n'était pas autre qu'Ochmah le

* L'Aka□a n'est pas le Saint-Esprit, car alors l'Aka□a serait *Shekhinah*, tandis que l'Aka□a est le noumenon du Septenaire Cosmique dont l'Ether est l'âme. *Shekhinah* est un principe féminin comme l'était le Saint-Esprit avec les premiers chrétiens et les gnostiques. Jésus dit dans l'*Évangile des Hébreux*: «Et aussitôt ma mère le Saint-Esprit me prit et me porta par un des cheveux de ma tête, à la grande montagne nommée Tabor».

[Origen, *Comm. in Evang. Joannis*, tom. II, p. 64.] Ah bien! si c'est tout cela que vous autres «prêtres catholiques» enseignez à vos ouailles, je ne vous en félicite guère, et je les plains. Il paraît, après tout, que l'abbé a raison en disant que son Christ a «renversé les deux pôles, mettant en haut ce qui était en bas, et en bas ce qui était en haut» (*vide supra*). Toute la Kabbale avec les Séphiroth y a passé, et les cervelles des Kabbalistes aussi.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† M^{me} Blavatsky connaît aussi bien que n'importe qui la valeur ésotérique de cet hiérogamme sacré: , dont le dédoublement *ab intra* donne I et , lesquels forment par leur conjonction *ad extra* le nombre 10, chiffre symbolique de toute la création.

Principe féminin lui-même, l'Épouse d'Ensoph, la Sagesse immaculée revêtue d'un corps * au préalable afin de faire passer dans la *Nature humaine* ce même Verbe qu'elle avait déjà conçu du Saint-Esprit au Pôle Nord de la Création, † et qu'elle est venue, sous le nom de Marie, concevoir de nouveau au Pôle Sud afin de le mettre à la portée des déçus.

De là se mot qui revient si souvent sous la plume des Pères: «*Prius conceperat in mente quam in corpore, prius in coelis quam in terris*». Je ne dis là que des choses parfaitement intelligibles, sinon pour tout le monde, du moins pour un entendement ouvert comme est celui de Mme Blavatsky.

Je prévois ce qu'elle répondra; au fond c'est déjà dans son article. Elle dira: l'Incarnation de la Divinité dans l'Humanité est «l'Apothéose des Mystères de l'Initiation. Le Verbe fait chair est l'héritage du genre humain, etc». Rien de plus vrai; ce langage est absolument catholique. C'est encore vrai ce qu'elle ajoute: «*Le vos Dii estis* s'applique à tout homme né d'une femme». Voici comment nous l'expliquons, à la lumière du *Zohar*:

L'Humanité astrale, ou l'Adam-Ève originel et universel, formait avant sa chute un corps intégral et homogène dont le Christ divin était l'Esprit, sinon l'âme. L'âme en était plutôt Ochmah, ou la Sagesse immaculée. La chute se produit,—je n'en déterminerai ici ni la cause, ni la nature, afin de ne pas allumer deux controverses en même temps. Ce l'aît, bien connu de M^{me} Blavatsky mais expliqué par

* Nul initié n'ignore que les esprits se revêtent pour descendre, et se devêtent pour remonter.

† J'ai déjà eu l'honneur de dire à M. l'abbé Roca que son «Ochmah» (Chokmah donc, s.v.p.) était un principe masculin, le «Père». Voudrait-il faire de la Vierge Marie la Macroprosope barbu? Qu'il ouvre donc le *Zohar* et y apprenne la hiérarchie des Sephiroth, avant de dire et d'écrire des choses....impossibles. Voici ce que dit le *Zohar* de Rosenroth traduit par Ginsburg: *Chokmah ou «Sagesse»* (Ⓢ/Ⓢ'), puissance (ou principe) active et masculine, représentée dans le cycle des noms divins par *Jah* (Ⓢ*). Voyez *Isaïe*, xxvi, 4—«Fiez-vous à Jah, Ⓢ*», etc. Que Jah soit traduit par «Éternel» comme dans la Bible française d'Ostervald, ou bien encore par «Seigneur Dieu» comme dans la version anglaise, c'est toujours *Dieu*, le Père, et non la *déesse* mère, Marie.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

elle différemment, amena la dislocation de ce grand corps—si l'on peut appeler de ce mot les Constitutions biologiques du Pôle-Nord ou spirituel. Ma contradictrice s'exprimerait autrement; elle dirait que l'Humanité passa de l'état d'Homogénéité où elle se trouvait dans le Ciel, à l'état d'Hétérogénéité où elle se trouve sur la terre. Soit. Je veux bien ici négliger l'idée de péché qu'implique notre Dogme. Dans tous les cas, elle s'est vue contrainte de toucher à la question très embarrassante pour elle, de l'origine du mal; elle s'en est tirée comme elle a pu, pas brillamment.* La Kabbale l'explique beaucoup mieux, et l'*Évangile Éternel*, imprimé à Londres en 1857 (chez Trübner et C^{ie}, 60, Paternoster Row) jette de vives clartés sur ce mystère. Peu importe, au fond de notre discussion.

Le fait certain, c'est que le mal désole la terre et que nous en souffrons tous. Les Bouddhistes sont condamnés par leur système à faire à Dieu une singulière paternité avec ce *vos Dii estis* interprété à leur manière. Il n'y a pas que les Boschimans et les Zoulous sauvages, mais pas même les Cartouche, les Mandrin, et les Troppmann qui ne puissent se réclamer et s'autoriser du titre de *Fils de Dieu*. Jolie famille, en vérité.† L'enseignement chrétien, sans frustrer ces pauvres gens de leur droit à l'héritage paternel, prend du moins la précaution de leur imposer une tenue convenable. Il leur offre le moyen, aussi rationnel que juste et facile, de se réintégrer dans les conditions primordiales de leur originelle sainteté: Vous êtes déçus, dégradés; on

* Ce n'est pas à moi de dire si je m'en suis tirée brillamment ou non. Toujours est-il que je sais du moins ce que j'y dis et la valeur réelle comme le sens des mots et des noms dont je me sers, ce qui n'est pas toujours le cas avec M. l'abbé Roca. Je regrette de le dire, mais avant de donner des leçons aux autres, il ferait bien peut-être d'étudier la Kabbale *élémentaire*.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† Pas plus mauvaise cette «famille» que celle de David, *assassin* et *adultère*, dont on a fait descendre Jésus, ou bien celle qui se présenta devant l'Éternel au dire du livre de Job: «Or, il arriva un jour, que les enfants de Dieu vinrent se présenter devant l'Éternel, et Satan aussi entra parmi eux» (*Job*, i, 6; ii, 1), *Satan le plus beau des Fils de Dieu*. Si Satan, tout comme vous, moi, Troppmann, n'était pas le fils de Dieu, ou plutôt de l'Essence du Principe divin *absolu*, votre Dieu serait-il l'*Infini* et l'*Absolu*? Il faudrait, cependant, tout en polémisant, ne pas oublier d'être logique.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

se relève aisément. Adhérez de nouveau à ce Christ dont vous vous êtes détachés. Vous n'avez pas à vous élever dans le ciel jusqu'à lui; il est descendu sur la terre jusqu'à vous. Il est dans votre nature, dans votre chair. Chaque cellule, chaque alvéole, chaque monade tombée de son corps céleste dans les bas lieux, se réassocie à lui en s'affiliant à l'Église qui, d'après saint Paul (*Éph.*, i, 23), est le vrai corps social du Christ-Homme,—corps organique dans lequel se cache le Christ-Esprit, comme le papillon se cache dans la nymphe de la chrysalide. Et voilà tout le mystère de l'Incarnation! où est l'absurdité? *

En quoi ce Dogme choque-t-il la raison? En quoi répugne-t-il à ceux qui reconnaissent le Principe-Christ, ou le Christ universel? Ah! si l'on niait l'existence de ce Christ, alors oui, il deviendrait impossible de nous entendre.

VII. C'est là justement ce que je voudrais savoir de ma digne correspondante, avant de pousser plus loin cette controverse. † La question qui se pose n'est pas précisément celle à laquelle a déjà répondu M^{me} Blavatsky en disant: «. . . un Christ (ou *Christos*) divin n'a jamais existé *sous une forme humaine* ailleurs que dans l'imagination des blasphémateurs qui ont carnalisé *un principe universel et tout impersonnel*. . . . celui qui voudra dire '*Ego sum veritas*' est encore à naître . . . » Elle est autre, pour le moment; je l'élève plus haut: *Le Christos existe-t-il, n'importe où dans le Ciel ou sur la terre, et n'importe sous quelle forme, divine ou humaine?*

J'ai l'honneur de prévenir M^{me} Blavatsky qu'alors même que son appareil visuel et conceptif ne lui permettait pas de comprendre et

* Je fais observer que l'abbé Roca se revêt encore une fois des dogmes Bouddhistes, Védantins, ésotériques et théosophiques, ne faisant que substituer aux noms de Parabrahm et d'Adi-Bouddha celui du «Christ». En Angleterre, on dirait que M. l'abbé s'amuse à importer du charbon à Newcastle. Je ne m'oppose pas à la doctrine puisqu'elle est la nôtre, mais bien à la limitation que les chrétiens se permettent. Qu'ils prennent donc un brevet d'invention tout de suite pour ce qui a été reconnu et enseigné sous d'autres noms dans un âge où même les molécules des chrétiens ne flottaient pas encore dans l'espace.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† M. l'abbé la «poussera» alors tout seul. Je me retire et refuse absolument de prolonger la controverse. Qu'il apprenne d'abord l'A, B, C, de l'Ésotérisme et de la Kabbale, et on verra après.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

RÉPONSE DE L'ABBÉ ROCA

365

d'admettre que le Principe-Christ puisse devenir le Christ-Chair ou l'Homme-Dieu, même alors je la tiendrais encore pour une Chrétienne,* et voici pourquoi:

Dans notre Saint Évangile qu'elle considère avec Strauss, ou peu s'en faut, comme le rituel maçonnique de tous les lieux communs de l'entendement humain; dans la bouche de N.-S. Jésus-Christ qu'elle prend pour une idéalisation de l'Humanité terrestre, se trouvent des paroles adorables que j'interprète en sa faveur, et que je suis heureux de pouvoir lui appliquer avec justice,—je le crois du moins; écoutez ce divin langage:

«Quiconque aura parlé contre le Fils de l'Homme [l'Homme-Dieu], il lui sera pardonné; mais si quelqu'un parle contre le Saint-Esprit [le Christ-Esprit], son péché ne lui sera remis ni dans ce siècle [l'ère présente, celle qui se ferme], ni dans l'autre [l'ère qui s'ouvre de nos jours]». (*Math.*, xii, 32;—*Marc*, iii, 28-29;—*Luc*, xii, 10;—*I Jean*, v, 16) † C'est bien remarquable que ces paroles aient été répétées par les Quatre Évangélistes: ‡ c'est qu'elles ont une importance capitale. La version selon saint Marc est la plus libérale de toutes. Elle porte: Les choses dites contre le Fils de l'Homme seraientelles des *blasphèmes*, ces blasphèmes mêmes seront pardonnés, s'il ne s'adressent pas au Saint-Esprit (*loc. cit.*).

Or, croire que M^{me} Blavatsky a blasphémé contre le Saint-Esprit, rien ne m'y autorise; j'affirmerais plutôt le contraire. § Ce n'est donc pas moi qui lui dirai *raca*—jamais, jamais!

* Chacun a le droit de me tenir pour ce qu'il veut; mais une illusion ne sera jamais une réalité. J'ai autant le droit de tenir le Pape pour un Bouddhiste; je m'en garderai bien: n'est pas bouddhiste qui veut.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† [According to J. F. Ostervald's version of the French Bible, the passage from *Matth.*, xii, 32 runs as follows: «Et si quelqu'un a parlé contre le Fils de l'homme, il pourra lui être pardonné; mais celui qui aura parlé contre le Saint-Esprit n'en obtiendra le pardon, ni dans ce siècle, ni dans celui qui est à venir».—*Compiler.*]

‡ D'autant plus remarquable qu'ils se contredisent en tout ailleurs.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

§ «Pour faire un civet de lièvre, il faut d'abord prendre un lièvre». Pour accuser une personne «de blasphème» il faudrait d'abord prouver que cette personne *croit* à la chose contre laquelle elle blasphème. Or, comme je ne crois pas à *la révélation* du contenu des deux Testaments, et

Elle peut se convaincre par le propre dire de Notre-Seigneur, que le Christ n'est pas une «idole jalouse et cruelle qui damne pour l'éternité ceux qui ne veulent pas se courber devant elle», puisque même cette injure trouvera grâce et remission devant l'infini miséricorde de son cœur d'Homme-Dieu.

Ce que je crains, pour M^{me} Blavatsky, c'est que les altercations qu'elle a eues avec des prêtres chrétiens, et qui ont dû être fort vives, de part et d'autre, puisqu'elle se dit payée «pour connaître les susdits prêtres», n'aient beaucoup contribué à fausser dans son idée la notion de Jésus-Christ. Il faut convenir que beaucoup d'entre nous, ministres de son doux Évangile, ne brillons guère, à notre époque, par l'intelligence approfondie des Arcanes du Christ, et que notre tolérance n'a pas toujours été, bien s'en faut, conforme à celle de son cœur. Il est certain, par exemple, que le terrible Christ de l'Inquisition, notre œuvre à nous, n'était pas du tout fait pour rendre aimable et pour recommander le vrai Christ, celui du sermon de la montagne et de la vision du Tabor.* Il est également certain que notre Christ à nous,

que pour moi les «Écritures» Mosaiques et Apostoliques ne sont pas plus *Saintes* qu'un roman de Zola, et que les *Védas* et les *Tripitakas* ont bien plus de valeur à mes yeux, je ne VOIS pas comment je pourrais être accusée de «blasphème» contre le Saint-Esprit. *C'est vous qui blasphémez* en l'appelant «un principe mâle» et le doublant d'un principe féminin. *Raca* sont ceux qui acceptent les divagations des «Pères de l'Église» à leurs «Conseils» comme l'inspiration directe de ce Saint-Esprit. L'histoire nous montre ces fameux Pères s'entretenant à ces assemblées, se battant et se disputant comme des portefaix, intrigant et couvrant d'opprobre le nom de l'Humanité. Les *Payens* en rougissaient. Tout nouveau converti qui s'était laissé attraper mais qui avait conservé sa dignité et un grain de bon sens retournait, comme l'Empereur Julien, à ses vieux dieux. Laissons donc là ces sentimentalités qui me touchent peu. Je connais trop mon histoire, et bien mieux que vous ne connaissez votre *Zohar* Monsieur l'abbé.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* Encore une erreur. Il y a des bons et des mauvais prêtres dans le Bouddhisme comme chez les chrétiens. Je déteste la *caste* sacerdotale et m'en méfie; je n'ai absolument rien contre les individus isolés qui la composent.

prêtres, a fait prendre en horreur, par bien du monde, hélas! Celui dont [nous] avons trop négligé de suivre l'exemple, alors qu'il nous avait dit pourtant:

«*Exemplum enim dedi vobis, ut, quemadmodum ego feci vobis, ita et vos faciatis*». (Jean, xiii, 15.)

VIII. Je termine, pour cette fois-ci du moins, en mettant en lumière l'hommage religieux que M^{me} Blavatsky rend, à son insu, à notre Saint Évangile: «Le Nouveau Testament, dit-elle, contient certainement de profondes vérités ésotériques, mais c'est une allégorie». Ce mot d'*allégorie* sera remplacé un jour, dans le vocabulaire de cette exégète, par celui d'*œuvre typique*. Les *types*, en toutes choses, ont ceci de particulier, d'après Platon, c'est qu'ils sont une allégorie en même temps que l'expression juste d'une réalité historique. Alors elle se rendra compte de cette merveilleuse chose qu'elle constata dans une note: «Chaque acte du Jésus du Nouveau Testament, chaque parole qu'on lui attribua, chaque événement qu'on lui rapporte pendant les trois années de la mission qu'on lui fait accomplir, repose sur le programme du Cycle de l'Initiation, cycle basé lui-même sur la précession des Équinoxes et les signes du Zodiaque».*

Eh oui! je crois bien! comment en aurait-il pu être autrement? Non seulement tout cela repose sur ce Programme, mais le remplit et devait le remplir. Les ésotéristes chrétiens disent la raison de cette

C'est le *système entier* que j'ai en horreur, comme tout honnête homme qui n'est pas un hypocrite ou un fanatique aveugle. La majorité a la prudence de se taire; moi, ayant le courage de mes opinions, je parle et dis ce que je pense.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

*Je ne rends aucun hommage du tout à votre «Saint Évangile»; détrompez-vous. Ce à quoi je rends hommage a cessé d'être visible pour votre Église comme pour vous-même. Étant devenue dès les premiers siècles le sépulcre blanchi dont parlent les Évangiles, cette Église prend le masque pour la réalité et ses interprétations personnelles pour la voix du Saint-Esprit. Quand à vous, Monsieur l'abbé, vous qui présentez vaguement le personnage caché sous ce masque, vous ne le connaîtrez jamais, parce que vos efforts tendent dans une direction contraire. Vous cherchez à *mouler les traits de l'inconnu caché sur ceux du masque*, au lieu d'arracher bravement ce dernier.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

harmonie; * ils savent, ils enseignent que Jésus-Christ est la réalisation historique de toute la vertu et de tout l'esprit de prophétisme qui avait rayonné dans le monde, avant sa venue, qui avait éclairé les Voyants de tous les sanctuaires et qui s'était répandu dans la nature elle-même, parlant par la voix des Oracles, par l'organe des Pythonisses, des Sibylles, des Druidesses, etc. Il faut entendre saint Paul là-dessus: «*Multifariam, multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in Prophetis: novissime, diebus istis locutus est nobis in Filio, quem constituit heredem universorum, per quem fecit et saecula*» (Hebr., i, 1-2). Il faudrait citer tout cet admirable Chapitre, et le lire à la lumière du *Zohar*.†

Nous savons de plus que Jésus-Christ était l'objet des pressentiments, des prévisions, de l'attente et des soupirs de toutes les générations qui l'avaient précédé, non seulement dans Israël comme dit Jérémie (xiv, 14, 17), mais dans le monde entier, chez tous les peuples, sans exception, comme avait dit Moïse: «*Et ipse erit*

expectatio gentium» (*Gen.*, xlix, 10).‡

* Jusqu'ici je n'ai trouvé que *cacophonie* dans les opinions des ésotéristes chrétiens, cacophonie et confusion. Preuve votre *Ochmah*.—H. P. BLAVATSKY

† Oui-dà! Est-ce à «la lumière du *Zohar*» qui émane de la lanterne de votre Ésotérisme à vous? Cette lumière est bien incertaine, je crains; un vrai feu follet. Nous venons d'en avoir la preuve!—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

‡ Une jolie preuve, encore celle-là! Jérémie qui dit: «Ce que ces prophètes prophétisent en mon nom [celui de Jéhovah, *votre Dieu*] *n'est que mensonge*; je ne les ai point envoyés, et ne leur ai point donné de charge, et ne leur ai point parlé; ils vous prophétisent des visions de mensonge, de divination, de néant, et la tromperie de leur cœur» (xiv, 14). Or, comme les prophètes des Gentils n'ont jamais prophétisé au monde Jéhovah, à qui la prophétie—*si c'en est une*—s'adresse-t-elle directement si ce n'est à vos «glorieux ancêtres, les Pères de l'Église»? Votre citation n'est pas heurcuse, Monsieur l'abbé. Le verset 17 parle de la *nation d'Israël*, en disant «la Vierge fille de mon peuple», et non de la Vierge Marie. Il faut lire les textes hébreux, s'il vous plaît, et non nous citer la traduction latine défigurée par Jérôme et autres. C'est le Messie des Juifs qui n'a jamais été reconnu dans Jésus, qui était «l'objet des pressentiments et des prévisions» du

RÉPONSE DE L'ABBÉ ROCA

369

Comment le Christ aurait-il répondu à cette attente universelle, comment aurait-il rempli le Programme de l'ancien Cycle de l'Initiation, si un seul texte, un seul point de l'idéale conception eût été violé même d'un *iota* ou d'un *apex*? Voilà pourquoi le Christ disait: «. . . *iota unum, aut unus apex non praeteribit a lege, donec omnia fiant*» (*Math.* v. 18).

Ah! j'en conviens, le Cycle de l'Initiation, que connaît si bien M^{me} Blavatsky, a pressenti autre chose que ce qui s'en est réalisé jusqu'à nos jours sous l'influence du Christ.* Oui! mais la Carrière du Rédempteur du monde n'est pas close; sa mission n'est pas finie, elle commence à peine. . . . Nous ne sommes qu'aux premiers rudiments du Saint Évangile, à la phase préparatoire. Notre théologie est toute primaire et notre civilisation s'ébauche, encore toute grossière. Laissez venir le *Christ-Esprit-Amour*, le Paraclet promis. Il est dans les nues, il approche, il descend à travers les brouillards épais de notre entendement, et les froideurs glaciales de notre cœur. Il revient justement comme il l'avait dit, et dans l'appareil même qu'il avait annoncé dans son langage parabolique.† Que d'âmes déjà qui sentent avec Tolsti, les tièdes haleines du printemps nouveau! et combien d'autres qui voient, avec Lady Caithness, poindre la radieuse Aurore de l'ère nouvelle!

Le second avènement se fait exactement comme Jésus l'avait prédit.

Je m'arrête là. Si M^{me} Blavatsky le veut bien, nous y reviendrons, et peut-être serai-je assez heureux pour lui fournir les preuves

peuple d'Israël; et c'est le *Kalki Avatar*, le Vishnou, le Bouddha-primordial, etc., qui est attendu avec «des soupirs» dans tout l'Orient, par les multitudes des Indes. À la *Vulgate* que vous me citez je vous opposerai cinquante textes qui démolissent l'édifice bâti avec tant de ruse par vos «illustres ancêtres». Mais, vrai. . . . ayons pitié des lecteurs du

Lotus!—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* C'est fort heureux, ma foi. La confession vient un peu tard, mais, mieux vaut tard que jamais.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† Lorsque ce «langage parabolique» sera compris correctement et que tout ce qui appartient au César—*payen*—dans les Évangiles sera rendu à César (au Bouddhisme, Brahmanisme, Lamaïsme et autre «ismes»), nous pourrons reprendre cette discussion. En attendant ce jour heureux —H. P. BLAVATSKY.

scientifiques que réclame de moi, à grands cris, cette belle âme altérée de la sainte soif des vérités divines et qui adore le Christ, sans le savoir.*

Chère Madame, pardonnons-nous réciproquement nos petites vivacités. Que voulez-vous, le Discours des Perfections et des Béatitudes a beau nous être prêché, à vous sur la montagne de Gaya depuis près de trois mille ans, à moi sur la montagne de Galilée depuis moins de deux mille ans, il nous faut toujours payer à l'Humanité déchue le tribut de nos faiblesses natives: *Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto*.

L'AB. ROCA,
Chanoine honoraire.

*Je pardonne volontiers à M. l'abbé Roca ses petits *lapsus linguae*, à condition qu'il étudie sa Kabbale plus sérieusement. Ma «belle âme» ne réclame rien du tout de mon trop pétulant correspondant; et si cette âme réclame quelque chose «à grands cris», c'est qu'on ne dénature pas ses convictions ou qu'on la laisse tranquille. Je fais grâce à l'abbé Roca de ses «preuves scientifiques». La science ne peut exister pour moi en dehors de la vérité. Puisque je n'impose mes convictions à personne, qu'il garde les siennes—même celle que le Père Éternel (*Chochma*) est son principe féminin. Je puis lui assurer, sur ma parole d'honneur, que rien de ce qu'il pourrait dire du Bouddha, des «Frères», et de l'Ésotérisme de l'Orient ne me *briserait le cœur*, à peine cela me ferait-il rire.

Et maintenant que j'ai répondu sur tous ses points et combattu tous ses fantômes, je demande que la séance soit levée et les débats clos. J'ai l'honneur de faire mes adieux respectueux à M. l'abbé Roca, et lui donne rendezvous dans un meilleur monde, dans le Nirvâna—près du trône de Bouddha.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

REPLY OF ABBÉ ROCA

371

REPLY OF ABBÉ ROCA TO MADAME BLAVATSKY'S ALLEGATIONS AGAINST CHRISTIAN ESOTERICISM

[*Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. III, June, 1888, pp. 129-150]

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

I. We mention it with circumspection, but Madame Blavatsky is rather embarrassing and one hardly knows exactly what course to adopt with her. If you imagine that she has treated you roughly—and I am not the only one to state this—it is because “you have such a sensitive skin.” You are mistaking for smacks the caresses of a hand whose kindness is so Buddhistical that it “would not even strike a dog to stop him from barking.” The lightest puff from her “appears to you as a squall” and what is but a *zephyr* seems a cold blast to you, La Fontaine’s poor little reed that you are.

Well, let us proceed. Such misconceptions may be understood, if need be; but what cannot possibly be conceived is how the same person may be, in the eyes of Madame Blavatsky, at one and the same time “a *fidei defensor*,” a catholic priest, a simple curé, about whom one greatly regrets disturbing oneself, and an Abbé who has “thrown his cap of an *orthodox* and *papistical* ecclesiastic to the windmills,” and who, “ignoring the true esotericism of the *Brâhmašas* and the Buddhists, of the Pagan and Christian Gnostics, as well as of the authentic Chaldean Kabalah, and knowing nothing of the doctrines of the Theosophists” has fabricated for himself a Christianity of his own, an Esotericism *sui generis*.” She adds:

“I confess that I do not understand him.”

I can well believe it! Neither I nor anyone else in the world, dear Madame, will ever comprehend how the same man could be at the same time “a *fidei defensor*,” a poor curé about whom it is not worth being disturbed, and an Abbé deprived of his “*orthodox* and *papistical* biretta.” These terms clash among themselves as light clashes with darkness.*

* May it not be that these terms trace their origin to the letters themselves, to the “Notes” of Monsieur Roca? They appear, perhaps, to be *contradictory* in his “Notes” and under the handling of his pen—a skilled one—and when the reader has neither my replies nor his own letters—regular literary kaleidoscopes—before him. The Editor of *Le Lotus* would do well to publish our correspondence,

I will not say of Madame Blavatsky “that she is talking to the winds and at random,” as she does of me; but it certainly looks uncommonly like it, just the same, and in more than one place. Judge for yourselves: if I but raise my voice a little, then I am taking “a threatening tone” with her. Yet she has kindly acknowledged that I have the meekness, not of a Christian, because the Christians, she says, “are neither humble nor gentle in their polemics,”—but of a Buddhist.

She ought then to be satisfied—but not so. She takes it ill that I should speak as a Buddhist. That language in my mouth has no value to her. My homage produces on her the effect “of a greasy pole erected to serve as a support for Christian gewgaws attached to it in profusion, by an apostolic and Roman hand [good! for this occasion I have become the simple priest again], or of a Hindû-Theosophic doll bedecked with Popish amulets”—*Popish*, you understand!

Madame Blavatsky is really difficult to satisfy: “Far from being intoxicated by the heady fumes of my laudations,” the latter upset her. “I confess,” she says, “with my usual ‘frankness’ and my *unambiguous* rudeness,—I feel but a re-doubled mistrust.” And how black I become in her eyes! Listen to the dilemmas whose four horns she continually throws at me: “Either the Abbé Roca is obstinately determined not to understand me, or he has an ulterior purpose. . . . I believe, I understand . . . he either speaks to the winds and at random, or he wants to corner me, to force me to explain myself, so as to get a categorical answer from me . . . and thus compromise me in the eyes of Christians among whom I should make fresh enemies—and that would be so much gained.”

This is what she calls “my little arrangement.” Is not this rather scandalous on my part! Wicked Abbé Roca, can there be such cunning in that tricky simpleton? Never mind! The wretch will not succeed in ringing the changes on Madame Blavatsky. “The Editor of the French *Lotus* might be deceived by it, but the Editor of the English *Lucifer* has seen through it.” Consuls, sleep peacefully at the feet of the Capitol! There are watchers above, and you will hear their loud calls if the Gauls try to scale it.*

from the first of Monsieur Roca’s letters to the last, together with my replies. The brochure would be interesting, and the public would be better able to judge which one of us is wrong.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* The *geese* [*oies*, in French] saved the Capitol, but the *anointed* [*oints*, in French] lost Rome.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Mon Dieu! What have I done to this good lady, to put her into that state? It is true that I am a Catholic priest (although I may have “thrown my biretta over the windmills”). And these priests, you know, she knows them by heart! Had she not “a long life passed in studying the above-mentioned priests”? I have once been told that “Christolatry” sometimes inspires so much horror in certain souls that they become Christophobes and Priestophobes. Let us hope this never will be the case with the Buddhists, whose meekness is unchangeable.*

Pray rest assured and do not disturb yourself on my account. There is no reason for so much alarm. The Abbé Roca is not at all what he is supposed to be, and he is even grieved to have caused this anxiety. Believe me, dear Madame, neither “do I speak at random and to the winds,” as I hope to prove to you, nor do I seek to do you an ill turn, as you will see later. Your fears are groundless; you are looking for secrets where nothing exists, except perhaps a large share of *naïveté*.

I would willingly tell Madame Blavatsky what this poor Abbé Roca really is, if she had not, however,

sized him up better than he himself has been able to do, so far. That lady's first appraisal was the best; she would have done well to have held to it. Yes, she was more correct than I thought, when she called me *an optimist*. I recognize it now; I am more than an optimist, I am a *simplist* who is easily deceived, accustomed as I am to regard everything through the prism of the Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ.

II. It has cost me a good deal, even at this moment when Madame Blavatsky has dotted all her "i's" so carefully, to lessen my admiration and esteem for her. No! I cannot, I will not yet believe that she and her Masters are what she so positively affirms.

Just think! I had conceived such delightful hopes at the coming forth of this Hindu Theosophy, at the first accents of these Oriental voices issuing from the sanctuaries of the Himâlayas, and which

* The Abbe deceives himself again. I am neither "Christophobe," seeing that the impersonal Christos of the Gnosis is identical in my eyes with the divine Spirit of Illumination, nor "priestophobe," because I have the greatest respect for certain priests. Only I suspect Levites in general, the white bands of the Protestant as much as the cassock of the Catholic priest. The *odium theologicum* is known to me personally in all its fury. But, imbued with Buddhist principles, I hate none, not even my enemies. Does one hate the lightning because one puts a lightning conductor on the roof?—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

awakened such harmonious echoes in our Christian Churches.* I had so longed to believe that these new Sowers were those whose footsteps Joseph de Maistre fancied he already heard on the declivities of the neighbouring mountains. I was taking them for the evangelical workers of whom Christ spoke to the disciples: "The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest." (*Luke*, x, 2; *John*, iv, 35.) I wanted to convince myself that the "Brothers" were the Missionaries announced by the prophets, who, as Malachi assures us, will come to turn the heart of the Fathers (of the Orient) toward the heart of the Children (of the West), and the heart of the Children toward the heart of the Fathers, our glorious ancestors of the earliest ages. (*Mal.*, iv, 5-6, and *Matt.*, xi, 14.) †

* This is really too much! What? "Oriental voices issuing from the sanctuaries of the Himâlayas . . . awakened *such harmonious* echoes" in your "Christian Churches," when the priests of those Churches denounced them the moment they were heard in America or India—as the VOICE OF SATAN! That is a rose-water sentiment, an optimism contrary to all evidence.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† Hindu Theosophy—and the Abbé Roca knows this better than anyone—is declared by his Church as coming from hell. The Catholic bishops of Bombay, of Calcutta and other large Indian cities, were so frightened at the *harmony* of these voices, that from the very first they compelled the *faithful* to stop their ears with cotton. They threatened to excommunicate "whoever approached the *den of the sorcerers* just disembarked from America, of *those ambassadors plenipotentiary of the Enemy of God and of the Great*

Rebel [sic].” That was said by the Archbishop of Calcutta, if you please, in 1879. Another worthy and holy man, a missionary apostolic at Simla, dreading quite wrongly a “trade rival” perhaps, in the midst of a sermon announced my arrival in that rural Residence of the Viceroys of India, as that of “the Pythoness of the Great Accursed” (in the style of de Mirville and des Mousseaux). Were all these “good Fathers” deaf then, inasmuch as they did not hear the *harmonious* voices, even though their noses were on the Himâlayas? Is it not true then that for twelve years the descendants of your “glorious ancestors

REPLY OF ABBÉ ROCA

375

So then, am I deceiving myself? Your language distresses me, Madame, and will not charm anyone, anywhere in Europe, except perhaps in Turkey.

Then there would be, if the Buddhists do not deceive or slander themselves, two Theosophies, one Christian and the other Pagan, as I understand there are two mysticisms and even three, according to Gorres; and also two Gnosés or Gnosticisms and two occultisms, the one orthodox and the other heterodox, and again two Kabalahs, one dating from before Esdras, the other since him; and finally, two Magics, one white, the other black.

But then, Madame Blavatsky, instead of presenting me to her readers as denuded of all esotericism, and absolutely ignorant of all Theosophy, ought to have, it seems to me, admitted instantly that my Theosophy and my esotericism have nothing in common with those of her Masters,* for the simple reason that mine are Christian while hers are Pagan.†

of the earliest ages”—and why not add to (Saint) Cyril of bloody memory and to (Saint) Eusebius of mendacious memory, the *Holy* Fathers of the Inquisition, the Torquemadas and Co.—have followed us everywhere, tearing our reputations to pieces because they had no longer the power to mangle our bodies with their instruments of torture? Then all those piles of books and tracts, filled with the blackest calumnies, the most shameless lies, the basest insinuations, emanating from the missionaries, are nothing but a dream? We have them, however, in the Adyar Library.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* The esotericism of our Masters (let us rather say their divine philosophy) is that of the greatest of the PAGANS of antiquity. Elsewhere, the Abbé Roca speaks with contempt of the term. I will reply to that later. In the meantime I ask if there is in the entire universe a man so bold (except the ignorant missionaries) as to speak with contempt of the religion of Socrates, of Plato, of Anaxagoras, or of Epictetus! Assuredly, I should be the first to choose the position of servant to a pagan Plato, or an Epictetus, himself a slave, in preference to the office of highest cardinal to an Alexander or a Caesar Borgia, or even to a Leo XIII.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† That is what I have done in every possible way. One has but to read my two “Notes” to be assured of this.

Well, if she did not begin by doing me such justice at the outset of her refutation, she has carried it out with sufficient good grace at the end, and I thank her for it.

Here is what she says: “While in appearance we are both speaking the same language, our ideas as to the value and meaning of Christian

Yes, there are two Theosophies—the one, universal (ours), the other, *sectarian* (yours). Yes, there are two Kabalahs, the one compiled by Shimon ben Yohai in the *Zohar*, in the second century (we say the first), that is the true Kabalah of the Initiates, which is lost and whose original is to be found in the Chaldean *Book of Numbers*; and the other, that which exists in Latin translations in your libraries, the Kabalah denatured by Moses de Leon in the XIIIth century, a pseudograph composed by that Spanish Israelite, *with the aid and under the direct inspiration* of the Syrian and Chaldean Christians, *on the traditions preserved in the Midraschim* and the *remaining fragments of the true Zohar*. And that is why we find therein the Trinity and other Christian dogmas, and why the Rabbis, who have not had the opportunity of preserving among their family possessions some chapters of the authentic Kabalah, do not wish to know anything of that of Moses de Leon (that of Rosenroth and Co.), at which they laugh. See rather what Munk says on the subject. The mysticism and the Kabalah on which the Abbé and the others rely for data come down to them, then, from Moses de Leon, just as their system of the Sephiroth comes to them from Tholuck (l.c., pp. 24 and 31), their great authority. It was Hây Gaôn (died in 1038) who first developed the Sephirothal system as we have it now, *i.e.*, a system which, like the *Zohar*, and other Kabalistic books, has been filtered in the Middle Ages in the Gnosis already disfigured by Christians of the first centuries.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

[The reference to Tholuck, as found in the footnote above, is rather misleading. It occurred once before in an identical manner, namely in H.P.B.’s Essay on “The Esoteric Character of the Gospels.” *Vide*, pp. 216 and 238 of Volume VIII, in the present Series, where the actual source of this reference is fully explained in Compiler’s Notes.—*Compiler*.]

REPLY OF ABBÉ ROCA

377

esotericism, of Brâhman-Buddhist esotericism, and of that of the Gnostics, are diametrically opposed.” (Who knows? I am not yet really convinced of it, and I will tell why later on.) She continues: “He derives his conclusions and his esoteric data from sources which I could not know, since they are of modern invention [not so modern, Madame, as you will see], while I am speaking to him in the language of the ancient Initiates, and offer him the conclusions of archaic esotericism. . . .”

To which I answer that one may admit, if absolutely necessary, the co-existence of the two esotericisms, because error is probably as ancient as truth, at least on our earth, but in no case is it possible to admit the priority of the altered source over the pure one.*

Madame Blavatsky, if she were right, would have rendered us a very great service, but to her own

Masters the worst possible one, in opening our eyes as she has done to the *paganism* of their doctrines. The term is serious, but it is she who uttered it first (observe this point!), and who compels me to repeat it. †

* Precisely. Now, as Christian theology is the youngest, and as even the *Judaism of Esdras* is only 400 years older, it follows that the Aryan source, from which the Arhats of Gautama drank, having priority, must be *the pure source*, while all the others have been altered. It appears, then, that we are perfectly in accord, sometimes.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† I do not deny that. Being neither Christian, Jew nor Mussulman, I must necessarily be *pagan*, if the scientific etymology of the term means anything. The Abbé Roca gives the impression of making excuses for using the expression he repeats. One would say that he is trying to persuade the readers that it was only a *lapsus calami*, a *lapsus linguae*, or what not! Nothing of the kind. What is the origin of the word *pagan*? *Paganus* meant, in the first centuries, an inhabitant of the village, a peasant if you like, one who by living too far from the centres of the new proselytism had remained (very fortunately for him, perhaps) in the faith of his fathers. According to the Latin Church, all that is not *perverted* to the sacerdotal theology is *pagan*, idolatrous, and comes from the devil. And what does Roman etymology, whose adoption was imposed upon other peoples by circumstances, matter to us? *I am democratic*, in the true sense of the word. I

If the assertions I am going to reproduce are well founded, it would follow, clearly, that Monsieur de Saint-Yves was absolutely right when he wrote: “There will come a time when new *Judeo-Christian* missionaries [and not *pagan-Buddhist*] will re-establish a perfect communion of science and love with all the other religious centres of the Earth.” *

It will be found that these Judeo-Christian missionaries are necessarily the legitimate heirs of the Egypto-Chaldean sacerdotal caste, for Moses, as everyone knows, was initiated in all the Gnosis of the sanctuaries of Egypt (“*Et eruditus est Moyses omni sapientia Aegyptiorum. . .*”—*Acts*, vii, 22); these latter sanctuaries were derived, in their turn, by an ascending road from that mysterious and primitive Church of the *protogones* “*quorum nomina sunt inscripta in coelis*,” according to the solemn teaching of St. Paul (*Heb.*, xii, 23). † We easily ascend the rungs of that glorious genealogy in the splendid work of the author of the *Mission*.

Madame Blavatsky may see by this that the sources from which Catholics draw are not of modern invention, as she is pleased to say. ‡

respect the country folk, the people of the fields and of nature, the honest labourer scorned by the wealthy. And I say loudly that I prefer to be a *pagan* with the peasants than a Roman Catholic with the Princes of the Church, of whom I take very little notice so long as I do not find them in my way. Once again, the Abbé Roca is making a little *fiasco*. *Vide* note 6.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

[Note 6 is the footnote on p. 375 of the present Volume, beginning with: “The esotericism of our Masters

“—*Compiler.*]

* *Mission des Juifs*, p. 178. [Ch. IV, p. 198, in the 1884 edition].

† [The wording of the Vulgate is different, namely: “Et Ecclesiam primitivorum, qui conscripti sunt in coelis, et judicem omnium Deum, et spiritus justorum perfectorum.”—*Compiler.*]

‡ Grieved to contradict him again, and always. In my eyes the sources drawn upon by the Catholics are extremely modern in comparison with the *Vedas* and even with Buddhism. The “solemn teachings” of St. Paul date from the sixth or seventh centuries—when, revised and thoroughly corrected, his *Epistles* were finally admitted into the Canon of the Gospels, after having been exiled therefrom for several centuries—rather than from the year 60. Otherwise why should (Saint) Peter have

REPLY OF ABBÉ ROCA

379

The thesis of the Marquis de Saint-Yves emerges victoriously from the very assertions of my learned antagonist.* I should lose one illusion; I should confirm myself in my thoroughly Christian convictions.

persecuted his enemy Paul, personifying him under the name of Simon Magus, a name which has become as generic as that of a Torquemada or a Merlin?—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* I really fear that the thesis of Monsieur (le Marquis de) Saint-Yves will emerge from my hands no more victorious than the rosy dreams and the optimism of my honoured correspondent. The sources found therein ascend no higher than the personal visions of the learned author. I have never read the entire work, but it was enough for me to read its first pages and a manuscript-review of one of his fervent admirers, to assure myself that neither the esoteric data of the sacred literature of the Brâhmanas, nor the exoteric researches of the Sanskritists, nor the fragments from the history of the Âryas of Bharatavarsha, nothing, absolutely nothing known to the greatest pandits of the country, or even to the European Orientalists, supports the “thesis” which the Abbé Roca confronts me with. The book eclipses as a learned fiction the works of Jules Verne, and the Abbé might as well compare my “*contradictions*” with the works of Edgar Poe, the Jules Verne of American mysticism. The work is entirely devoid of any historical or even traditional basis. The “biography” of Râma therein is as fictional as the idea that the Kali-Yuga is the Golden Age. The author is certainly a man of great talent, but the fantasy of his imagination is more remarkable than his learning. The Hindu Theosophists are ready to pick up the gauntlet if it is thrown to them. Let the Abbé Roca or any other admirer of the *Mission* take the trouble of transcribing all the passages that mention Râma and the other heroes of ancient Aryâvarta. Let them support their statements by *historical* proofs and the names of ancient authors (of which we find no trace in this work). The Hindu

The Hindu Theosophists would then have given their full measure. As to Theosophy itself, it would certainly lose nothing of its universalist character. Madame Blavatsky recognizes that “Theosophy is neither Buddhism, Christianity, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Hinduism, nor any other *ism*: it is the *esoteric synthesis* of all the known religions and philosophies.” It is true that in her eyes it is not Christianity either; but I venture to think that she deceives herself on this point. To my way of thinking, true Theosophy is indistinguishable from real Christianity, from the integral, scientific Christianity, such as is conceived by the author of the *Mission*, by enlightened Catholics, orthodox Kabalists, and the Johannites of the traditional school of Joachim of Floris, of John of Parma, of the Franciscans and the Carmelites, to which Renan has dedicated the

and other Theosophists will reply and overturn one by one all the stones of the masonry based on the phonetic etymology of the name of Râma of which the author has made a veritable Tower of Babel. We will give all the historical, theological, philological, and above all, logical proofs. Râma had nothing to do with the Py-Ramides (!!), nothing either with Rameses, not even with Brahmâ or the Brâhmanas, in the desired sense; and still less with the “Ab-Ramides” (!!). Why not with Ram-bouillet, in that case, or “le Dimanche des Rameaux”? The *Mission des Juifs* is a very fine romance, an admirable fantasy; but the Râma found therein is no more the Râma of the Hindus than the Whale that swallowed Jonah is the zoological whale that disports itself in the northern and southern seas. I do not at all object to the Christians swallowing whale and Jonah if they have the appetite, but I absolutely refuse to swallow the Râma of the *Mission des Juifs*. The fundamental idea of that work would delight those English people who seek the honour of proving that the British nation descends in direct line from the Ten Tribes of Israel; from those tribes that were *lost before they were born*, for the Jews never had but two tribes, of which one was but a caste, the tribe of Judah, and the other, that of Levi, the priestly caste. The others were only the personified signs of the zodiac. What can Râma have to do with all that?—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

most learned of his works of criticism, which is certainly not his *Life of Jesus*. (See the dissertation by Renan on *The Eternal Gospel* of Joachim of Floris, published in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, Vol. 64, beginning with the first part of the issue for July 1, 1866, pp. 94-142.)

III. As for myself, I had hoped, in my childish simplicity—have I not said it and repeated it enough in my first articles in *Le Lotus*?—that the “Sages” of the Himâlayas would themselves also take part in the erection of that beautiful and glorious Theosophico-Christian Synthesis. Was it a dream? Should it be renounced? Well, no, surely not yet, not so soon!

Madame Blavatsky, it is clear, does not give any quarter; she strikes with a quick and lively hand: “I

have put an extinguisher," she says, "on the rosy hopes that shone in the flame of his first letter because I could not take seriously the simple compliments of civility addressed to the *pagan* Mahâtman by a Christian and a French Abbé." The term is there, but it is I who underline it, and for good reason.

Ah! Madame, what you have taken for simple compliments was no trap! It was a sincere expression, if not of a firmly established conviction, at least of an ardent desire and a wish entirely in your favour. Christ could very well get along without the Buddhists, if necessary, but the Buddhists could not do without him, certainly . . . and you do not intend to do without him either, intelligent as you are.* I do not despair of dissipating the misunderstanding. There certainly is one.

* I permit myself to reply that Buddha is the elder of Jesus (confused with the Christos) by 600 years. The Buddhists, however, whose religious system was crystallized ever since their last ecclesiastical Council which preceded the first Christian Church Council by several centuries, have been able to do very well without the Christ invented by the latter. They have their Buddha, who is their Christ. Their religion, which transcends in moral sublimity all that had been hitherto invented or preached in this world, is older than Christianity, and all that is fine in the Sermon on the Mount, *i.e.*, all that is found in the Gospels, was already to be found for centuries in the Aphorisms of Gautama the Buddha, in those of Confucius, and in the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ*. What does the Abbé Roca mean when saying that the Buddhists "could not do without him [Christ], certainly," when

I do not regret a single word I have published, in view of the agreement in *Le Lotus* and elsewhere, for if, on the one hand, I receive smart blows and bitter jests in good part, on the other I gain the advantage of having given proof of goodwill, wide tolerance and an entirely Christian—if not Buddhist—brotherliness.

My honoured correspondent flatters herself upon having upset my edifice. She says: "It has crumbled under a slight puff, like a simple house of cards and that was not always my fault." Whose fault was it, then? Surely not mine either, and I should be grieved if I had compelled Madame Blavatsky to undermine that foundation, because she would have been working against herself and not against me. It is true that she would have destroyed my hopes. It is also true that she would have broken my heart as a Frenchman, a European, and a Priest of Jesus Christ. But by the same blow she would have destroyed herself and, in that event, upon what would she have had to congratulate herself?*

they have done without him for more than 2,000 years? What is he trying to insinuate by speaking of me in the same way? I have the honour to tell him that there was a time when I believed as he does; there was a time when I was idiot enough to believe what had never been proved to me, but now, believing no more in such things and approaching the sixties, it is not likely that I should be caught by the bird-lime of fine sentiments. No, there is no "misunderstanding" at all. If, in spite of all my care in dotting my "i's," he persists in not wishing to understand me, he shows bad faith. May it be that he wants to drag on an impossible polemic because, not being able to answer my arguments by proofs of the same weight, he nevertheless wants to have the last word? In that case I yield to him with

pleasure. I have really neither time nor desire to fight windmills.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* The Abbé is really too sensitive. I thank him for his solicitude so very. . . . Christian, for my humble self; but at the risk of “breaking his heart” once more, the truth compels me to say that I do not at all understand his obstinacy, notwithstanding my protestations, in bewailing my luck. Unfortunately for him, I have very little softness in my nature. He will not be the one to instruct me. If he continues his jeremiads to the tune of “My

REPLY OF ABBÉ ROCA

383

IV. Now then. What can this mean? To dispossess Christ of his great conquests? To throw back the civilization inaugurated under his auspices? To overturn his altars in the West? To root out his name from our soil? Beware! Renan, the same Renan that Madame Blavatsky invokes against me, would exclaim: “*To tear away that name from the world today would be to shake it to its foundations!*” (*Life of Jesus*).

Too late! He is the Master, his spirit has become our universal spirit for ever, his soul has passed into our soul. Christ and Christianity are from now on merged into one. The principles of his Holy Gospel, all the ideas of fraternity, of tolerance, of solidarity, of union, of mutuality and so many others which are associated with the glorious trilogy of our immortal Revolution, are preparing themselves to triumph with the very principles of modern Civilization, which will carry its benefits to all parts of the world, even to that Orient which does not yet understand it, and which would try to stifle it in its cradle in the West. Mercy of God!

Just heaven! What an undertaking! One of my ideas has been called “*baroque*”; what shall we call this one, if it really had an

Aunt Aurora” he will edify the readers of *Le Lotus* even less than myself. Let him be calm, and let his afflicted heart be consoled. *Those wishing to destroy me cannot do so.* I am in no danger. Others, stronger than he, have tried to bend me to their ideas, or to break me. But I have the epidermis of a *Tartar*, it seems; neither threats garlanded with the flowers of his rhetoric and powdered with the pale roseate tints of his poetry, nor compliments addressed to “my intelligence,” will affect me. I appreciate at its exact value his wish to confound the two esotericisms—the Christian esotericism and that of the old Initiates of submerged Atlantis. That does not prevent me from seeing that his wish is built on the terrain of “Castles in Spain.” The two esotericisms have done very well without each other throughout the centuries, and they can live side by side, without running foul of each other too much, for the rest of the *Kali-Yuga*, the black and fatal age, the age of sinister causes and effects, which has not prevented it being represented in France as the Golden Age—one of the errors accepted by the Abbé Roca with that innocent faith so characteristic of him.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

384

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

origin in any brain at all? Can we not see what is happening? What tremors everywhere! And we are merely at the dawn of the *New Day*. The Sun which is Christ, “*the Solar Christ*,” as the Kabalists say, that sun has not yet risen upon us; but the dawn is beautiful, full of radiances, of perfumes, of hopes! And some would wish to stop the ascending march of that orb! How senseless! No, neither the Seine, nor any other river in Europe, will see that which the Nile saw, in the words of Lefranc de Pompignan:

The Nile has seen on its banks
The dark dwellers of the desert
Insult, with their savage cries
The Radiant Star of the Universe

for then would happen what that poet sings of in the same stanza:

Feeble crime, weird frenzies!
While those monsters barbaric
Fling their insolent shouts,
The God, pursuing his path,
Pours torrents of light
On his obscure blasphemers!

That is not possible. No, no! Christianity will never have to repel such an attempt. That cannot be what Madame Blavatsky wishes to say.*

V. However, here are terrible affirmations, or rather bold denials; but they reveal their meaning to my understanding, and I will tell you how.

“I deny *in toto*,” she exclaims, “the Christ invented by the Church, as well as all the doctrines, all the interpretations, and all the dogmas, ancient and modern, concerning that personage. . . . I have the keenest aversion for the *Christolatry* of the Churches. I hate those dogmas and doctrines which have degraded the ideal Christos by making of it an absurd and grotesque anthropomorphic fetish. . . .

* The Abbé is deceived. That was exactly my idea. The “obscure blasphemers” of which he speaks are the Christians of the first centuries, those bands of catechist-brigands, of ragged and filthy robbers, collected from all the sewers of the Roman provinces and posing as the “guard of honour” of their *Holinesses*, the Cyrils of murderous memory, the butchers of the Holy Church—that sanguinary bludgeon for nearly seventeen centuries.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Jesus crucified was nothing but an *illusion*, and his story an allegory. . . . For me Jesus Christ, *i.e.*, the Man-God of the Christians, copied from the Avatâras of every country, from the Hindu Kṛishṣa as well as the Egyptian Horus, was never a *historical* person. He is a deified personification of the glorified type of the great Hierophants of the Temples, and his story as told in the New Testament is an allegory.” *

These denials are doubtless serious, and it is evident that in these terms and on this ground, no understanding would be possible, no agreement could be hoped for between Christians and Buddhists. †

But one can, happily, turn the question, present it under another aspect, and solve it favourably. We are going to try. One word alone embarrasses me more than all the former ones; it is the one I have underlined above, in the passage from Madame Blavatsky, who has called herself and the Mahâtmans PAGANS. But have we to take that strange expression seriously? I do not think so. There must be something equivocal in it, a *quid pro quo*.

I have an idea that nothing in the world is less pagan than the conceptions of the “Brothers” and their adepts.‡ My noble partner will tell me if I am deceived, after having done me the honour of listening very attentively. I beg her to reflect well on the matter, and above all not to imagine there is a trap hidden under my words. My speech is frank, limpid as a rock-crystal.

Let us see, my dear Madame, if you have a clear understanding of the meaning covered by the word *pagan* in the European mind and according to all our lexicons? (See among others, Quicherat,

* Exactly, the Abbé has a remarkable memory—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† The Abbé is right. No agreement is possible between the dogmatic Christolatry of the Churches, his anthropomorphic god, and the Oriental Esotericists. True Christianity died with the Gnosis.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

‡ I will explain myself for the last time. The “Brothers” and “Adepts,” being neither Christians, Jews, nor Mussulmans, are necessarily, like myself, *pagans*, Gentiles to all Christians; just as the latter, and above all Roman Catholics, are pure *idolaters* to the “Brothers.” Is that clear enough? The Christ of the Abbé Roca said: “Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not” (*Matt.*, x, 5). I am astonished to find an Abbé making so little of the order of his Master!—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

which I have just *consulted again*.) The pagans, in Latin *pagani*, from *pagus*, a village or hamlet, were the *pago-dedite*, the villagers, the country-folk, the ignorant idolaters who took the sacred signs, the religious symbols, for divine realities. How can one imagine that the Mahâtmans and Madame Blavatsky are that kind of people? I am convinced to the contrary.*

It is evidently not what this learned woman intended to declare, no more than she meant to make herself out to be anti-Christian when she so maltreated that Christ, the Man-God, whom she does not see demonstrating clearly and plainly his historical existence, by the experimental proof the philosopher employed when he proved motion by walking in front of the negators. Christ lives with us otherwise than as a vain abstraction, for he is about to upset our world and reverse its two poles, setting up on high that which was below, and bringing down that which was on high, just as he declared. † Have we indeed eyes and see not?

I know what Madame Blavatsky will say to this. . . We are coming to that. Meanwhile, I will face her with her own words, on this occasion quite suitable and correct: "I have," she says, "the most profound respect for the transcendental idea of the universal *Christos*

* Grieved, of course, as ever, to dissipate your sweet illusion, dear Monsieur. I needed that lesson in etymology, and I thank the Abbé Roca for it. I fancy, however—though I am not so indiscreet as to ask his age—that I knew all that he has just taught me before Madame his mother had put his legs into his first pair of pants. The *pagani* or pagans may have been *ignoramus* in the eyes of those more ignorant than themselves—those who accepted for coined money the ass of Balaam, the whale of Jonah, and the snake that walked on its tail—but they were not more *ignorant* for all that. As the most serious books speak of Plato, Homer, Pythagoras, Virgil, etc., etc., under the name of "*pagan* philosophers and poets," the *Adepts* are found in good company. The little lesson is as useless as it is far-fetched. I am a *pagan* to the Christians, and I am proud of it. I have said it elsewhere: I far prefer to be a pagan with Plato and Pythagoras, than a Christian with the Popes.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† [These expressions are actually to be found in *Job*, v, 11, and in *Isaiah*, xxvi, 5.—*Compiler*.]

(or Christ) who lives in the soul of the Bushman and the savage Zulu, as well as in that of the Abbé Roca." However, you are going to see that we shall close by finding the crux of the difficulty, and by scientifically resolving it, perhaps even by finding ourselves in perfect agreement. "So much the better, so much the better," I will repeat after her.

The difficulty she experiences in admitting a *carnalized* Christ, as she states, will not remain for ever, I hope. Her eyes are made to see clearly.*

Undoubtedly a "personal adjective cannot be applied to an ideal principle" while it remains in the state of an abstract Ideal: but is the ???????, or Universal Christ, *living in our souls*, a *mere idea*, in her estimation, an absolutely impersonal Principle? I am well aware that she has said *yes*, but she has also said that the Mahâtman are pagans. There are confusions in this which will have to be dissipated.


VI. Christ, according to the orthodox Gnosis, is this: he is the Son engendered from all eternity in the adorable arcane of the *internal Processions of the divine Essence*; he is the living Word, consubstantial with the Father, of whom St. John speaks; he is the *Lumen de Lumine* of the Nicene symbol, chanted in Christian Churches of all rites and every sect (excepting the *Filioque* of the Orthodox Greco-Russian

* Let us hope so. And it is exactly because my eyes saw clearly, perhaps before my esteemed correspondent was born, that I have no desire to fall back into the Egyptian darkness of ecclesiastical dogmas. I will never accept the inventions of Irenaeus, of Eusebius, of Jerome, or of Augustine. The "orthodox gnosis" is blasphemous in my eyes, a hideous nightmare which transforms the Divine Spirit into a cadaver of putrefied flesh, and clothes it in cheap human finery. I only recognize the Gnosis of Marcion, Valentinus and such others. A day will come when Oriental Esotericism will render the same service to Christian Europe as Apollonius of Tyana rendered at Corinth to his disciple Menippus. The golden wand will be stretched out towards the Church of Rome, and the ghoulish which has vampirized the civilized peoples since Constantine will resume its spectral, demoniacal form of incubus and succubus. So may it be!
Om mani padme hum!—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Church). * That same Word was conceived before all the centuries and outside the essentially divine Circle, by Ochmah, or the emanated feminine Principle, † or again living Wisdom, immaculate and fecundated by Ensoph ‡ who is the masculine Principle, issued from

* Yet the *Filioque* of the Orthodox Greco-Russian Church is that which is nearest to the Esotericism of the Orient.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† If by “Ochmah” the Abbé means *Chokhmah-Wisdom* (sometimes phonetically written Hochmah), he is seriously deceived again. Hochmah is not “the feminine Principle” but the masculine, since it is the “Father,” *Yah*, while *Binah*, Intelligence or Jehovah, is the feminine Principle, “the mother.” Here is the superior triangle of the 10 Sephiroth:



Kether is the highest point (*Eheieh*, Being). The Microprosopus, the Son, emanates from the two Sephiroth, Chokhmah (or rather *Chokhma*, because the letter H was added by the Christian Kabalists) and Binah, the two lower points of the triangle. But where has the Abbé studied the Kabalah?—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

‡ En-Soph was never “the masculine Principle” any more than Parabrahm. En-Soph is the Incomprehensible, the Absolute, and has no sex. The first lesson in the *Zohar* teaches us that En-Soph (the Non-Being, for it is Absolute Being *per se*) cannot create. And not being able to create the Universe (which is only a reflection of En-Soph on the objective plane), it can still less *engender*.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.



God, and called the Holy Ghost (perhaps the Akâ□a * of the Hindus). †

Now then, we Catholic priests, teach that this same Son, this same Word, was made flesh: *Verbum caro factum est* (*John*, i, 14—Nicene Creed). Here it is in a few words: This only Son, this Word conceived from all eternity by the Father-Mother who is God (⊙), then begotten by En-Soph, I, in the bosom of Ochmah, (○), has come to our Earth, *to the south pole of Creation*, to take a body and a soul like ours, but not a Spirit, mark well, not a human personality. There are not two persons in the Man-God, there is only the Person of the eternal Son, of the *Principle* as he calls himself (*John*, viii, 25); but there are two natures, the *assuming* nature which is wholly divine, and the *assumed* nature which is yours, Madame, which is mine, as it is that of the

Bushman and the Zulu savage, as it is that of the greatest rascal to be found on earth.

Man had nothing to do with that *generic conception*; that mystery was accomplished within a Virgin, and could be accomplished only therein. Because that Virgin was none other than Ochmah, the feminine Principle herself, the Spouse of En-Soph, the immaculate

* $\text{A}^{\text{K}}\text{A}^{\text{A}}$ is not the Holy Ghost, because then $\text{A}^{\text{K}}\text{A}^{\text{A}}$ would be *Shekhinah*, while $\text{A}^{\text{K}}\text{A}^{\text{A}}$ is the noumenon of the Cosmic Septenary whose soul is Ether. *Shekhinah* is a feminine principle just as the Holy Ghost was with the early Christians and the Gnostics. Jesus said in the *Gospel of the Hebrews*: “And forthwith my mother the Holy Ghost took me and carried me by one of the hairs of my head to the great mountain called Tabor.” [Origen, *Comm. in Evang. Joannis*, tom. II, p. 64.] Well indeed, if that is what you “Catholic priests” teach your flocks, I can hardly congratulate you on it and I am sorry for them. It seems, after all, that the Abbé is right in saying that his Christ has “reversed its two poles, raising that which was below, and putting down that which was on high” (*vide supra*). The entire Kabbalah with the Sephiroth has had its share of it, and the brains of the Kabbalists also.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† Madame Blavatsky knows as well as anyone the esoteric value of that sacred hierogram:  which, when separated *ab intra*, gives I and , which form by their conjunction *ad extra* the number 10, the symbolic figure of the whole Creation.

Wisdom clothed with a body,* as a preliminary to causing the same Word she had already conceived by the Holy Ghost at the north pole of Creation, to pass into *human Nature*; † and she came, under the name of Mary, to conceive again at the south pole in order to place it within reach of the fallen.

Hence the expression occurring so often in the Church Fathers: “*Prius conseperat in mente quam in corpore, prius in coelis quam in terris*” I am referring here to things which are perfectly intelligible, if not for everyone, than at least for an open-minded understanding as is that of Madame Blavatsky.

I foresee what she will reply; in fact it is already in her article. She will say: the Incarnation of Divinity in Humanity is “the Apotheosis of the Mysteries of Initiation. The Word made flesh is the heritage of the human race, etc.” Nothing is more true; that language is absolutely Catholic. It is also true, as she adds: “The *vos Dii estis* applies to every man born of woman.” Here is the way we explain it in the light of the *Zohar*:

Astral Humanity, or the original and universal Adam-Eve, formed, before the Fall, an integral and homogeneous body of which the divine Christ was the Spirit, if not the soul. The soul of it was rather Ochmah, or the immaculate Wisdom. The Fall took place—I will not determine either the cause or the nature of it now, so as not to have two controversies at once. That fact, well known to Madame Blavatsky, but explained differently by her, brought about the dislocation of that great body—if one can call by that name the biological Constitutions of the spiritual or north pole. My antagonist

* No initiate is ignorant of the fact that spirits clothe themselves to descend and divest themselves to re-ascend.

† I have already had the honour of telling the Abbé Roca that his “Ochmah” (Chokhmah then, if you please) was a masculine principle, the “Father.” Does he want to make of the Virgin Mary the bearded Macroprosopus? Let him open the *Zohar* and learn therein the hierarchy of the Sephiroth, before saying and

writing things which are . . . impossible. Here is what the *Zohar* of Rosenroth says, as translated by Ginsburg: *Chokmah* or “Wisdom” (????), the active and masculine power (or principle), represented in the circle of divine names by *Jah* (??). See *Isaiah*, xxvi, 4—“Put your trust in Jah, ??,” etc. Whether *Jah* be translated as “Eternal,” in the French Bible of Ostervald, or even as “Lord God,” in the English version, he is always *God*, the Father, and not the mother-goddess, Mary.—H.P. B.

would express it otherwise; she would say that Humanity passed from a state of Homogeneity or the Heavenly, to a state of Heterogeneity in which it finds itself on earth. Be it so. I am quite willing here to ignore the idea of sin which is implied in our dogma. In any case she was compelled to touch upon the question, very embarrassing for her, of the origin of evil; she has extricated herself as well as she could, but not brilliantly.* The *Kabalah* explains it far better, and *The Eternal Gospel* printed in London in 1857 (Trübner and Co., 60 Paternoster Row) throws a vivid light upon that mystery. It is of little consequence to the main point of our discussion.

What is certain is that evil desolates the earth and that we all suffer from it. The Buddhists are condemned by their system to ascribe to God a singular paternity with that *vos Dii estis* interpreted in their fashion. Not only the Bushmen and the Zulu savages but even the Cartouche, the Mandrin and the Troppmann † can use the name and think themselves warranted to bear the title of *Sons of God*. A pretty family, forsooth.‡ The Christian teaching, without defrauding those poor creatures of their paternal heritage, takes at least the precaution of imposing on them a fitting behaviour. It offers them

* It is not for me to say whether I have extricated myself brilliantly or not. I always know, at least, what I am talking about, and the actual value as well as meaning of the words and the names I use, which is not always the case with the Abbé Roca. I regret to say it, but before giving lessons to others, it would perhaps be well for him to study the elementary *Kabalah*.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† [The reference is here to three famous French criminals, namely: Louis Dominique Cartouche, a thief (b. ca. 1693; executed Nov. 28, 1721), Louis Mandrin, a bandit and highwayman (b. 1724; exec. May 26, 1755), and Jean Baptiste Troppmann, an assassin (b. 1849; exec. at Paris, Jan. 19, 1870).—*Compiler*.]

‡ A “family” no worse than that of David, *assassin* and *adulterer*, from whom Jesus is made to descend; or even than that which presented itself before the Eternal, as the *Book of Job* tells us: “Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them” (*Job*, i, 6; ii, 1), *Satan, the handsomest of the Sons of God*. If Satan, just like you, me, or Troppmann, was not the son of God, or rather of the Essence of the *absolute* divine Principle, would your God be *Absolute* and *Infinite*? We ought not to forget, even in argument, to be logical.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

the means, as rational as it is just and easy, to reinstate themselves into the primordial conditions of their original sanctity: You are fallen, degraded; it is easy to recover. Cling once more to that Christ from whom you have cut yourselves off. You do not have to lift yourselves to heaven to reach him: he has come down to earth within reach of you. He is within your own nature, in your own flesh. Every cell, every monad, dropped from his celestial body into the lower regions, is

re-associated with him through affiliation with the Church which, according to St. Paul (*Eph.*, i, 23), is the true social body of the Christ-Man—the organized body in which is hidden the Christ-Spirit, as the butterfly is hidden in the chrysalis. And there is the entire mystery of the Incarnation! Where is the absurdity? *

In what respect does this Dogma shock the reason? In what respect does it repel those who recognize the Christ-Principle, or the Universal Christ? Now, if one denied the existence of that Christ, then indeed it would be impossible to understand each other.

VII. It is exactly this that I would like to learn from my worthy correspondent before pursuing the controversy any farther. † The question is not exactly that to which Madame Blavatsky has already replied by saying: “a divine Christ (or Christos) never existed *under a human form* outside the imagination of blasphemers who have carnalized *a universal and entirely impersonal principle* he who would say ‘*Ego sum veritas*’ is yet to be born.” It is actually another question, a more basic one, namely: *Does the Christos exist, whether in heaven or earth, or under any form, divine or human?*

* I notice that the Abbé Roca is arraying himself again in the Buddhist, Vedântin, Esoteric, and Theosophical tenets, only substituting the name “Christ” for those of Parabrahman and Âdi-Buddha. In England they would say he amuses himself by carrying coals to Newcastle. I am not opposed to the doctrine, for it is our own, but rather to the limitation set by the Christians. Let them, then, at once take out a patent of invention for that which has been recognized and taught under other names in an age when even the molecules of the Christians had not yet floated in space.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† The Abbé will have to “go” it alone then. I withdraw and absolutely refuse to prolong the controversy. Let him first learn the A.B.C. of Esotericism and the Kabalah, and after that we shall see.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

I have the honour of warning Madame Blavatsky that even if her visual and conceptual apparatus does not allow her to understand or admit that the Christ-Principle could become the Bodily-Christ or the Man-God, I should consider her still a Christian,* and for this reason:

In our Holy Gospel, which she almost considers, with Strauss, as the Masonic Ritual of the most commonplace human understanding, in the mouth of our Saviour Jesus Christ, whom she takes for an idealization of terrestrial humanity, the blessed words that I interpret in her favour are found, and I am happy to apply them to her with justice—I believe so, at least. Listen to the divine utterance:

“And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man [the Man-God], it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost [the Christ-Spirit], it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world [the present era, which is closing], neither in the world to come [the era which is opening in our day].”

† It is indeed remarkable that these words were repeated by the Four Evangelists. ‡ The reason is that they are of capital importance. The version according to St. Mark is the most liberal of all. It declares that were the things said against the Son of Man *blasphemies*, these blasphemies would be forgiven, if they were not addressed to the Holy Ghost (*loc. cit.*).

Nothing authorises me, however, to say that Madame Blavatsky has blasphemed against the Holy Ghost: I should rather declare the contrary.§ Therefore, it is not I who would say *raca* to her—never, never!

* Everyone has the right to think what they will of me; but an illusion will never be a reality. I have as much right to hold that the Pope is a Buddhist, but I will take pretty good care not to do so; a Buddhist is not he who merely wishes to be one.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† *Matt.*, xii, 32; *Mark*, iii 28-29; *Luke*, xii, 10; *I John*, v, 16.

‡ All the more remarkable in view of their contradicting each other in everything else.—H. P.

BLAVATSKY.

§ “First catch your hare, then cook him.” To accuse a person “of blasphemy” you must first prove that such a person *believed* the thing against which he blasphemes. Now, as I do not believe *in the revelation* of the contents of the two Testaments and as, for me, the Mosaic and Apostolic “Scriptures” are not more *Holy* than a novel of Zola’s, and as the *Vedas* and the *Tripitakas* have far

She can convince herself by the very words of our Saviour, that Christ is not that “jealous and cruel idol which damns for eternity those who decline to bow down before it,” since even that insult will find grace and forgiveness before the infinite mercy of the heart of the God-Man.

What I fear for Madame Blavatsky, is that the discussions she has had with Christian priests, and which must have been extremely lively on both sides, since she says she paid “for having known the said priests,” may have greatly contributed to falsify her ideas about Jesus Christ. We must admit that many among us, ministers of his meek and lowly Gospel, hardly shine in our age with a profound understanding of the Arcanes of Christ, and that our tolerance has not always been—indeed far from it—in conformity with that of his heart. It is certain, for example, that the terrible Christ of the Inquisition, our own work, was not at all designed to render the true Christ agreeable or to recommend him, the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount and of the vision of Tabor.* It is equally certain that our own Christ, the one of the priests, is held in abomination, alas, by many people. He whose example we have sorely neglected to follow, while he had told us: “*Exemplum enim dedi vobis, ut quemadmodum ego feci vobis, ita et vos faciatis*” (*John*, xiii, 15).

more value in my sight, I do not see how I could be accused of “blasphemy” against the Holy Ghost. *It is you who blasphemé* in calling it “a male principle” and the lining of a feminine principle. *Raca* are those who accept the divagations of the “Fathers of the Church” to the “Councils” as the direct inspiration of that Holy Ghost. History shows us those famous Fathers killing each other at their assemblies, fighting and quarrelling among themselves like street porters, intriguing and covering with opprobrium the name of Humanity. The *Pagans* blushed to see it. Every new convert who had permitted himself to be entrapped, but who had retained his dignity and a grain of good sense, returned, like the Emperor Julian, to his old gods. Let us leave these sentimentalities, then, which affect me very little. I know my history too well, and rather better than you know your *Zohar*, Monsieur l’Abbé.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* Still another mistake. There are good and bad priests in Buddhism, just as there are among the Christians. I detest the sacerdotal *caste*, and always distrust it,

VIII. I close, for this occasion at least, by bringing to light the religious homage Madame Blavatsky renders, perhaps unwittingly, to our Holy Gospel: “The New Testament,” she says, “certainly contains profound esoteric truths, but it is an allegory.” The word *allegory* will be replaced someday, in the vocabulary of this exegete, by *typal work*. In all questions, types have the peculiarity, according to Plato, of being at the same time an allegory and the exact expression of a

historical reality. Then she will realize for herself that wondrous thing she mentioned in a note: “Every act of the Jesus of the New Testament, every word attributed to him, every event related of him during the three years of the mission he has been made to fulfil, rests on the *programme of the Cycle of Initiation*, a cycle itself founded on the Precession of the Equinoxes and the Signs of the Zodiac.” *

Yes, indeed, I really believe it! How could it be otherwise? All this not only rests on the programme but fulfils it and must fulfil it. Christian esotericists disclose the reason of that harmony; † they know and teach that Jesus Christ is the historical realization of all the virtues and all the spirit of prophecy that had illumined the world before his coming, which had illumined the Seers of every

but I have absolutely nothing against the single individuals who compose it. It is the *whole system* for which I have a horror, just as every honest man has, who is not a hypocrite or a blind fanatic. The majority are prudent and keep silent; as for me, having the courage of my opinions, I speak and declare exactly what I think.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* I render no homage at all to your “Holy Gospel”; undeceive yourself! That to which I render homage has ceased to be visible to your Church or to yourself. Having become, from the early centuries, the whited sepulchre spoken of in the Gospels, that Church takes the mask for the reality, and its personal interpretations for the voice of the Holy Ghost. As for yourself, Monsieur l’Abbé, you who so vaguely sense the personage hidden under the mask, you will never recognize him because your efforts lead in the opposite direction. You are trying to *mold the features of the concealed unknown upon those of the mask*, instead of boldly tearing off the latter.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† Till now I have only found *cacophony* in the opinions of Christian Esotericists, cacophony and confusion. For proof see your *Ochmah*.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

sanctuary and which was diffused in Nature herself, speaking through the voice of the Oracles, and the agency of Pythonesses, Sibyls, Druidesses, etc. Listen to St. Paul’s words on this subject: “*Multifariam multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in Prophetis: novissime diebus istis locutus est nobis in Filio, quem constituit heredem universorum, per quem fecit et saecula*” (*Hebr.*, i, 1-2). The entire admirable chapter should be quoted, and read in the light of the *Zohar*. *

We know, moreover, that Jesus Christ was the subject of anticipations, previsions, longings and expectations of all the generations before him, not only in Israel, as Jeremiah says (xiv, 14, 17), but throughout the whole world, among all peoples without exception, as Moses said: “*Et ipse erit expectatio gentium*” (*Gen.*, xlix, 10). †

* Yes, indeed! Is that “the light of the *Zohar*” which emanates from the lamp of your own Esotericism? That light is rather uncertain, I fear; a veritable will-o’-thewisp. We have just had proof of it.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† A pretty proof, this one! A Jeremiah who said: “The prophets prophesy lies in my name: I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake unto them: they prophesy unto you a false vision and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart” (*Jer.*, xiv, 14). Now, as the prophets of the Gentiles have never prophesied Jehovah to the people, to whom was the prophesy directly addressed—if it be one—if not to your “glorious ancestors, the Fathers of the Church”? Your quotation is not a happy one, Monsieur l’Abbé. Verse 17 speaks of the *nation of Israel*, in saying “the virgin daughter of my people,” and not of the Virgin Mary. The Hebrew text should be read, if you please, not quotations from the Latin

translation disfigured by Jerome and others. It is the Messiah of the Jews, who has never been recognized as Jesus, that was the “subject of anticipations, and previsions,” by the people of Israel, and it is the *Kalki-Avatâra*, Vishnu, the Primordial Buddha, etc., who is expected “with longing” throughout the entire Orient, and by the multitudes in India. Against the *Vulgate*, which you quote, I would oppose fifty texts which demolish the edifice built with so much cunning by your “illustrious ancestors.” But, really, let us have pity on the readers of *Le Lotus*.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

How would Christ have responded to that universal expectation, how would he have fulfilled the Programme of the ancient Cycle of Initiation, if one text alone, if one point only of the ideal conception had been violated by an *iota* or an *apex*? That is why he said: “. . . *iota unum, aut unus apex non praeteribit a lege, donec omnia fiant*” (*Matt.*, v, 18).

Certainly, I agree that the Cycle of Initiation, which Madame Blavatsky knows so well, had a foreknowledge of other things than those which have been realized up to the present under the influence of Christ.* Yes indeed, but the career of the Redeemer of the world is not yet over; his mission is not finished; it has hardly begun. . . We are only at the very beginning, in the preparatory stage, of the Holy Gospel. Our theology is quite primitive and our civilization merely outlined and still extremely crude. Let the *Christ-Spirit-Love*, the promised Paraclete, come! He is in the clouds, he approaches, he descends through the thick fog of our understanding and the icy indifference of our hearts. He returns, exactly as he said, and in the vesture he foretold in his language of parables.† How many are the souls who already feel, with Tolsti, the gentle breezes of a new springtime! And how many others who, with Lady Caithness, see the dawning of the radiant Aurora of the new era!

The Second Coming is taking place exactly as Jesus has predicted it.

I will stop here. If Madame Blavatsky really wishes it, we will resume, and perhaps I shall, happily enough, be able to furnish her the scientific proofs loudly demanded of me by that fine soul athirst with a holy desire for divine truth, and which, without knowing it, adores the Christ. ‡

* That is excellent, indeed. The confession comes a little late, but, better late than never.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† When the “language of the parables” shall be correctly understood, and when all that belongs to Caesar—*pagan*—in the Gospels shall be rendered unto Caesar (to Buddhism, Brahmanism, Lamaism and other “isms”), we may resume this discussion. Awaiting that happy day H. P. BLAVATSKY.

‡ I willingly pardon the Abbé Roca his little *lapsus linguae*, on condition that he studies his Kabbalah more seriously. My “fine soul” demands nothing at all from my too petulant correspondent; and if that soul “loudly” demands anything at all, it is that her convictions should not be distorted and that she should be left alone. I will

Dear Madame, let us mutually forgive one another our little vivacities. What would you? Though the Sermon of Perfections and Beatitudes may have been preached to us—to you on the

Mount of Gayâ nearly three thousand years ago, to me on the Mount of Galilee less than two thousand years ago—nevertheless, it is to fallen Humanity that our inborn weaknesses are due: *Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto.**

ABBÉ ROCA,
Honorary Canon.

spare the Abbé Roca his “scientific proofs.” Science cannot exist for me outside of truth. Since I impose my beliefs on no one, let him keep his—even that the Eternal Father (*Chochma*) is his feminine principle. I can assure him, upon my word of honour, that nothing he would say of Buddha, of the “Brothers,” and of the Esotericism of the Orient would *break my heart*; it would hardly make me laugh.

And now that I have answered all his points and fought all his phantoms, I ask that the meeting be adjourned and the debate closed. I have the honour of expressing my respectful farewell to the Abbé Roca, and of making a rendezvous with him in a better world, in Nirvâna—near the throne of Buddha.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* [Terence, *Heauton Timoroumenos*, I, i, 25: “I am a man; I deem nothing that relates to man a matter foreign to myself.”—*Compiler.*]

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE PATH

399

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF *THE PATH*

[*The Path*, New York, Vol. III, No. 3, June, 1888, pp. 98-99]

To the Editor of *The Path*:

In the May number of your valuable journal [Vol. III], on page 60, we read:

With much deference we venture to invite the attention of *Lucifer* to the grave etymological objections to its definition of pentacle as a *six*-pointed star.

The attention of our benevolent corrector is invited to *Webster's Complete Dictionary of the English Language*, thoroughly revised and improved by Chauncey A. Goodrich, D.D., L.L., D., late Professor of Yale College, and Noah Porter, D.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy and Metaphysics in Yale College, assisted by Dr. C. A. F. Mahn of Berlin and others. New edition of 1880, etc., etc., London.

At the word "Pentacle," we read as follows:

Pentacle—a figure composed of two equilateral triangles, intersecting so as to form a *SIX-pointed star*, used in ornamental art, and also with superstitious import by the astrologers, etc.

This (Fairholt's) definition is preceded by saying that *pentacle* is a word from Greek PENTE, *five*—which every school boy knows. But *pente* or five has nothing to do with the word pentacle, which Éliphas Lévi, as all Frenchmen and Kabalists, spells *pantacle* (with an *a* and not with an *e*), and which is more correct than the English and less puzzling. For, with as much "deference" as shown by *The Path* to *Lucifer*, *Lucifer* ventures to point out to *The Path* that, according to old Kabalistic phraseology, a *pantacle* is "any magic figure intended to produce results."

Therefore if anyone is to be taken to task for overlooking "the grave etymological objections to the definition of pentacle as a six-pointed star," it is the great Professors who have just revised *Webster's Dictionary*, and not *Lucifer*. Our corrector has evidently confused *Pentagon* with *pentacle*. "Errare humanum est."

Meanwhile, as *Lucifer* was already laughed at for this *supposed* error by some readers of *The Path*, the latter will not, it is hoped, refuse to insert these few words at its earliest convenience, and thus justify its colleague from such an uncalled-for charge of *blunder and ignorance*. Let us correct each other's mistakes and errors, by all means; but let us also be fair to each other.

Fraternally,
THE EDITORS OF *Lucifer*.

LONDON, *May 21, 1888*

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

June, 1888

[ADDITIONAL MATERIAL]* CONVERSATIONS ON OCCULTISM

[*The Path*, New York, Vol. III, October, 1888, pp. 219-222; Vol. IX, October, November & December, 1894, and January & February, 1895, pp. 214-16, 244-47, 280-83, 310-12, and 390-91 respectively.]

Student.—What principal idea would it be well for me to dwell upon in my studies on the subject of elementals?

Sage.—You ought to clearly fix in your mind and fully comprehend a few facts and the law-s relating to them. As the elemental world is wholly different from the one visible to you, the laws governing them and their actions cannot as yet be completely defined in terms now used either by scientific or metaphysical schools. For that reason, only a partial description is possible. Some of those facts I will give you, it being well understood that I am not including all classes of elemental beings in my remarks.

First, then, Elementals have no form.

Student.—You mean, I suppose, that they have no limited form or body as ours, having a surface upon which sensation appears to be located.

Sage.—Not only so, but also that they have not even a

* [This Additional Material was inadvertently omitted from the First Edition of Volume IX.—*Compiler.*]

shadowy, vague, astral form such as is commonly ascribed to ghosts. They have no distinct personal form in which to reveal themselves.

Student.—How am I to understand that, in view of the instances given by Bulwer Lytton and others of appearances of elementals in certain forms?

Sage.—The shape given to or assumed by any elemental is always subjective in its origin. It is produced by the person who sees, and who, in order to be more sensible of the elemental's presence, has unconsciously given it a form. Or it may be due to a collective impression on many individuals, resulting in the assumption of a definite shape which is the result of the combined impressions.

Student.—Is this how we may accept as true the story of Luther's seeing the devil?

Sage.—Yes. Luther from his youth had imagined a personal devil, the head of the

fraternity of wicked ones, who had a certain specific form This instantly clothed the elementals that Luther evoked, either through intense enthusiasm or from disease, with the old image reared and solidified in his mind; and he called it the Devil.

Student.—That reminds me of a friend who told me that in his youth he saw the conventional devil walk out of the fire place and pass across the room, and that ever since he believed the devil had an objective existence.

Sage.—In the same way also you can understand the extraordinary occurrences at Salem in the United States, when hysterical and mediumistic women and children saw the devil and also various imps of different shapes. Some of these gave the victims information. They were all elementals, and took their illusionary forms from the imaginations and memory of the poor people who were afflicted.

Student.—But there are cases where a certain form always appears. Such as a small, curiously-dressed woman who had never existed in the imagination of those seeing her; and other regularly recurring appearances. How were those produced, since the persons never had such a picture before them?

Sage.—These pictures are found in the aura of the

person, and are due to pre-natal impressions. Each child emerges into life the possessor of pictures floating about and clinging to it, derived from the mother; and thus you can go back an enormous distance in time for these pictures, all through the long line of your descent. It is a part of the action of the same law which causes effects upon a child's body through influences acting on the mother during gestation.*

Student.—In order, then, to know the cause of any such appearance, one must be able to look back, not only into the person's present life, but also into the ancestor's past?

Sage.—Precisely. And for that reason an occultist is not hasty in giving his opinion on these particular facts. He can only state the general law, for a life might be wasted in needless investigation of an unimportant past. You can see that there would be no justification for going over a whole lifetime's small affairs in order to tell a person at what time or juncture an image was projected before his mind. Thousands of such impressions are made every year. That they are not *developed into memory* does not prove their non-existence. Like the unseen picture upon the photographer's sensitive plate, they lie awaiting the hour of development.

Student.—In what way should I figure to myself the essence of an elemental and its real mode of existence?

Sage.—You should think of them as *centers of energy* only, that act always in accordance with the laws of the plane of nature to which they belong.

Student.—Is it not just as if we were to say that gunpowder is an elemental and will invariably explode when lighted? That is, that the elementals knew no rules of either wrong or right, but surely act when the incitement to their natural action is present? They are thus, I suppose, said to be implacable.

Sage.—Yes; they are like the lightning which flashes or destroys as the varying circumstances compel. It has no regard for man, or love, or beauty, or goodness, but may

* See *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. 1, pp. 390 *et. seq.*, 397-400.

CONVERSATIONS ON OCCULTISM

400-C

as quickly kill the innocent, or burn the property of the good as of the wicked man.

Student.—What next?

Sage.—That the elementals live in and through all objects, as well as beyond the earth's atmosphere.

Student.—Do you mean that a certain class of elementals, for instance, exist in this mountain, and float unobstructed through men, earth, rocks, and trees?

Sage.—Yes, and not only that, but at the same time, penetrating that class of elementals, there may be another class which float not only through rocks, trees, and men, but also through the first of the classes referred to.

Student.—Do they perceive these objects obstructive for us, through which they thus float?

Sage.—No, generally they do not. In exceptional cases they do, and even then never with the same sort of cognition that we have. For them the objects have no existence. A large block of stone or iron offers for them no limits or density. It may, however, make an impression on them by way of change of color or sound, but not by way of density or obstruction.

Student.—Is it not something like this, that a current of electricity passes through a hard piece of copper wire, while it will not pass through an unresisting space of air?

Sage.—That serves to show that the thing which is dense to one form of energy may be open to another. Continuing your illustration, we see that man can pass through air but is stopped by metal. So that "hardness" for us is not "hardness" for electricity. Similarly, that which may stop an elemental is not a body that we call hard, but something which for us is intangible and invisible, but presents to them an adamant front.

Student.—I thank you for your instruction.

Sage.—Strive to deserve further enlightenment!

Student.—What is Occultism?

Sage.—It is that branch of knowledge which shows the universe in the form of an egg. The cell of science is a little copy of the egg of the universe. The laws which govern

the whole govern also every part of it. As man is a little copy of the universe—is the microcosm—he is governed by the same laws which rule the greater. Occultism teaches therefore of the secret laws and forces of the universe and man, those forces playing in the outer world and known in part only by the men of the day who admit no invisible real nature behind which is the model of the visible.

Student.—What does Occultism teach in regard to man, broadly speaking?

Sage.—That he is the highest product of evolution, and hence has in him a centre or focus corresponding to each centre of force or power in the universe. He therefore has as many centres or foci for force, power, and knowledge as there are such in the greater world about and within.

Student.—Do you mean to include also the ordinary run of men, or is it the exceptions you refer to?

Sage.—I include every human being, and that will reach from the lowest to the very highest, both those we know and those beyond us who are suspected as being in existence. Although we are accustomed to confine the term “human” to this earth, it is not correct to confine that sort of being to this plane or globe, because other planets have beings the same as ours in essential power and nature and possibility.

Student.—Please explain a little more particularly what you mean by our having centres or foci in us.

Sage.—Electricity is a most powerful force not fully known to modern science, yet used very much. The nervous, physical, and mental systems of man acting together are able to produce the same force exactly, and in a finer as well as subtler way and to as great a degree as the most powerful dynamo, so that the force might be used to kill, to alter, to move, or otherwise change any object or condition. This is the “vril” described by Bulwer Lytton in his *Coming Race*.

Nature exhibits to our eyes the power of drawing into one place with fixed limits any amount of material so as to produce the smallest natural object or the very largest. Out of the air she takes what is already there, and by compressing

it into the limits of tree or animal form makes it visible to our material eyes. This is the power of condensing into what may be known as the ideal limits, that is, into the limits of the form which is ideal. Man has this same power, and can, when he knows the laws and the proper centres of force in himself, do precisely what Nature does. He can thus make visible and material what was before ideal and invisible by filling the ideal form with the matter condensed from the air. In his case the only difference from Nature is that he does quickly what she brings about slowly.

Among natural phenomena there is no present illustration of telepathy good for our use. Among the birds and the beasts, however, there is a telepathy instinctually performed.

But telepathy, as it is now called, is the communicating of thought or idea from mind to mind. This is a natural power, and being well-understood may be used by one mind to convey to another, no matter how far away or what be the intervening obstacle, any idea or thought. In natural things we can take for that the vibration of the chord which can cause all other chords of the same length to vibrate similarly. This is a branch of Occultism, a part of which is known to the modern investigator. But it is also one of the most useful and one of the greatest powers we have. To make it of service many things have to combine. While it is used every day in common life in the average way—for men are each moment telepathically communicating with each other—to do it in perfection, that is, against obstacle and distance, is perfection of occult art. Yet it will be known one day even to the common world.

Student.—Is there any object had in view by Nature which man should also hold before him?

Sage.—Nature ever works to turn the inorganic or the lifeless or the non-intelligent and non-conscious into the organic, the intelligent, the conscious; and this should be the aim of man also. In her great movements Nature seems to cause destruction, but that is only for the purpose of construction. The rocks are dissolved into earth, elements combine to bring on change, but there is the ever onward march of progress in evolution. Nature is not destructive

of either thing or time, she is constructive. Man should be the same. And as a free moral agent he should work to that end, and not to procuring gratification merely nor for waste in any department.

Student.—Is Occultism of truth or of falsehood, is it selfish or unselfish; or is it part one and part the other?

Sage.—Occultism is colorless, and only when used by man for the one side or the other is it good or bad. Bad Occultism, or that which is used for selfish ends, is not false, for it is the same as that which is for good ends. Nature is two-sided, negative and positive, good and bad, light and dark, hot and cold, spirit and matter. The Black magician is as powerful in the matter of phenomena as the White, but in the end all the trend of Nature will go to destroy the black and save the white. But what you should understand is that the false man and the true can both be occultists. The words of the Christian teacher Jesus will give the rule for judgment: “By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?” Occultism is the general, all-inclusive term, the differentiating terms are White and Black; the same forces are used by both, and similar laws, for there are no special laws in this universe for any special set of workers in Nature’s secrets. But the path of the untruthful and the wicked, while seemingly easy at first, is hard at last, for the black workers are the friends of no one, they are each against the other as soon as interest demands, and that may be any time. It is said that final annihilation of the personal soul awaits those who deal in the destructive side of Nature’s hall of experience.

Student.—Where should I look for the help I need in the right life, the right study?

Sage.—Within yourself is the light that lighteth every man who cometh here. The light of the Higher Self and of the Mahâtma are not different from each other. Unless you find your Self, how can you understand Nature?

Student.—What is the effect of trying to develop the power of seeing in the astral light before a person is initiated?

CONVERSATIONS ON OCCULTISM

400-G

Sage.—Seeing in the astral light is not done through Manas, but through the senses, and hence has to do entirely with sense-perception removed to a plane different from this, but more illusionary. The final perceiver or judge of perception is in Manas, in the Self; and therefore the final tribunal is clouded by the astral perception if one is not so far trained or initiated as to know the difference and able to tell the true from the false. Another result is a tendency to dwell on this subtle sense-perception, which at last will cause an atrophy of Manas for the time being. This makes the confusion all the greater, and will delay any possible initiation all the more or forever. Further, such seeing is in the line of phenomena, and adds to the confusion of the Self which is only beginning to understand this life; by attempting the astral another element of disorder is added by more phenomena due to another plane, thus mixing both sorts up. The Ego must find its basis and not be swept off hither and thither. The constant reversion of images and ideas in the astral light, and the pranks of the elementals there, unknown to us as such and only seen in effects, still again add to the confusion. To sum it up, the real danger from which all others flow or follow is in the confusion of the Ego by introducing strange things to it before the time.

Student.—How is one to know when he gets real occult information from the Self within?

Sage.—Intuition must be developed and the matter judged from the true philosophical basis, for if it is contrary to true general rules it is wrong. It has to be known from a deep and profound analysis by which we find out what is from egotism alone and what is not; if it is due to egotism, then it is not from the Spirit and is untrue. The power to know does not come from book-study nor from mere philosophy, but mostly from the actual practice of altruism in deed, word, and thought; for that practice purifies the covers of the soul and permits that light to shine down into the brain-mind. As the brain-mind is the receiver in the waking state, it has to be purified from sense-perception, and the truest way to do this is by combining philosophy with the highest outward and inward virtue.

400-H

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

Student.—Tell me some ways by which intuition is to be developed.

Sage.—First of all by giving it exercise, and second by not using it for purely personal ends. Exercise means that it must be followed through mistakes and bruises until from sincere attempts at use it comes to its own strength. This does not mean that we can do wrong and leave the results, but that after establishing conscience on a right basis by following the golden rule, we give play to the intuition and add to its strength. Inevitably in this at first we will make errors, but soon if we are sincere it will grow brighter and make no mistake. We should add the study of the works of those who in the past have trodden this path and found out what is the real and what is not. They say the Self is the only reality. The brain must be given larger views of life, as by the study of the doctrine of reincarnation, since that gives a limitless field to the possibilities in store. We must not only be unselfish, but must do all the duties that Karma has given us, and thus intuition will point out the road of duty and the true path of life.

Student.—Are there any Adepts in America or Europe?

Sage.—Yes, there are and always have been. But they have for the present kept themselves hidden from the public gaze. The real ones have a wide work to do in many departments of life and in preparing certain persons who have a future work to do. Though their influence is wide they are not suspected, and that is the way they want to work for the present. There are some also who are at work with certain individuals in some of the aboriginal tribes in America, as among those are Egos who are to do still more work in another incarnation, and they must be prepared for it now. Nothing is omitted by these Adepts. In Europe it is the same way, each sphere of work being governed by the time and the place.

Student.—What is the meaning of the five-pointed star?

Sage.—It is the symbol of the human being who is not an Adept, but is now on the plane of the animal nature as to his life-thoughts and development inside. Hence it is the

symbol of the race. Upside down it means death or symbolizes that. It also means, when upside down, the other or dark side. It is at the same time the cross endowed with the power of mind, that is, man.

Student.—Is there a four-pointed star symbol?

Sage.—Yes. That is the symbol of the next kingdom below man, and pertains to the animals. The right kind of clairvoyant can see both the five- and the four-pointed star. It is all produced by the intersections of the lines or currents of the astral light emanating from the person or being. The four-pointed one means that the being having but it has not as yet developed Manas.

Student.—Has the mere figure of a five-pointed star any power in itself?

Sage.—It has some, but very little. You see it is used by all sorts of people for trademarks and the like, and for the purposes of organizations, yet no result follows. It must be actually used by the mind to be of any force or value. If so used, it carries with it the whole power of the person to whom it may belong.

Student.—Why is the sword so much spoken of in practical Occultism by certain writers?

Sage.—Many indeed of these writers merely repeat what they have read. But there is a reason, just as in warfare the sword has more use for damage than a club. The astral light corresponds to water. If you try to strike in or under water with a club, it will be found that there is but little result, but a sharp knife will cut almost as well under water as out of it. The friction is less. So in the astral light a sword used on that plane has more power to cut than a club has, and an elemental for that reason will be more easily damaged by a sword than by a club or a stone. But all of this relates to things that are of no right value to the true student, and are indulged in only by those who work in dark magic or foolishly by those who do not quite know what they do. It is certain that he who uses the sword or the club will be at last hurt by it. And the lesson to be drawn is that we must seek for the true Self that knows all Occultism

400-J

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

and all truth, and has in itself the protecting shield from all dangers. That is what the ancient Sages sought and found, and that is what should be striven after by us.

Student—Is there not some attitude of mind which one should in truth assume in order to understand the occult in Nature?

Sage.—Such attitude of mind must be attained as will enable one to look into the realities of things. The mind must escape from the mere formalities and conventions of life, even though outwardly one seems to obey all of them, and should be firmly established on the truth that Man is a copy of the Universe and has in himself a portion of the Supreme Being. To the extent this is realized will be the clearness of perception of truth. A realization of this leads inevitably to the conclusion that all other men and beings are united with us, and this removes the egotism which is the result of the notion of separateness. When the truth of Unity is understood, then distinctions due to comparisons made like the Pharisee's, that one is better than his neighbor, disappear from the mind, leaving it more pure and free to act.

Student.—What would you point out as a principal foe to the mind's grasping of truth?

Sage.—The principal foe of a secondary nature is what was once called *phantasy*; that is, the reappearance of thoughts and images due to recollection or memory. Memory is an important power, but mind in itself is not memory. Mind is restless and wandering in its nature, and must be controlled. Its wandering disposition is necessary or stagnation would result. But it can be controlled and fixed upon an object or idea. Now as we are constantly looking at and hearing of new things, the natural restlessness of the mind becomes prominent when we set about pinning it down. Then memory of many objects, things, subjects, duties, persons, circumstances, and affairs brings up before it the various pictures and thoughts belonging to them. After these the mind at once tries to go, and we find

wandering from the point. It must hence follow that the storing of a multiplicity of useless and surely-recurring thoughts is an obstacle to the acquirement of truth. And this obstacle is the very one peculiar to our present style of life.

Student.—Can you mention some of the relations in which the sun stands to us and nature in respect to Occultism?

Sage.—It has many such, and all important. But I would draw your attention first to the greater and more comprehensive. The sun is the center of our solar system. The life-energies of that system come to it through the sun, which is a focus or reflector for the spot in space where the real center is. And not only comes mere life through that focus, but also much more that is spiritual in its essence. The sun should therefore not only be looked at with the eye but thought of by the mind. It represents to the world what the Higher Self is to the man. It is the soul-center of the world with its six companions, as the Higher Self is the center for the six principles of man. So it supplies to those six principles of the man many spiritual essences and powers. He should for that reason think of it and not confine himself to gazing at it. So far as it acts materially in light, heat, and gravity, it will go on of itself, but man as a free agent must think upon it in order to gain what benefit can come only from his voluntary action in thought.

Student.—Will you refer to some minor one?

Sage.—Well, we sit in the sun for heat and possible chemical effects. But if at the same time that we do this we also think on it as the sun in the sky and of its possible essential nature, we thereby draw from it some of its energy not otherwise touched. This can also be done on a dark day when clouds obscure the sky, and some of the benefit thus be obtained. Natural mystics, learned and ignorant, have discovered this for themselves here and there, and have often adopted the practice. But it depends, as you see, upon the mind.

Student.—Does the mind actually do anything when it takes up a thought and seeks for more light?

Sage.—It actually does. A thread, or a finger, or a long darting current flies out from the brain to seek for knowledge. It goes in all directions and touches all other minds it can reach so as to receive the information if possible. This is telepathically, so to say, accomplished. There are no patents on true knowledge of philosophy nor copyrights in that realm. Personal rights of personal life are fully respected save by potential black magicians who would take anyone's property. But general truth belongs to all, and when the unseen

messenger from one mind arrives and touches the real mind of another, that other gives up to it what it may have of truth about general subjects. So the mind's finger or wire flies until it gets the thought or seed-thought from the other and makes it its own. But our modern competitive system and selfish desire for gain and fame is constantly building a wall around people's minds to everyone's detriment.

Student.—Do you mean that the action you describe is natural, usual, and universal, or only done by those who know how and are conscious of it?

Sage.—It is universal and whether the person is aware or not of what is going on. Very few are able to perceive it in themselves, but that makes no difference. It is done always. When you sit down to earnestly think on a philosophical or ethical matter, for instance, your mind flies off, touching other minds, and from them you get varieties of thought. If you are not well-balanced and psychically purified, you will often get thoughts that are not correct. Such is your Karma and the Karma of the race. But if you are sincere and try to base yourself on right philosophy, your mind will naturally reject wrong notions. You can see in this how it is that systems of thought are made and kept going, even though foolish, incorrect, or pernicious.

Student.—What mental attitude and aspiration are the best safeguards in this, as likely to aid the mind in these searches to reject error and not let it fly into the brain?

Sage.—Unselfishness, Altruism in theory and practice, desire to do the will of the Higher Self which is the "Father

CONVERSATIONS ON OCCULTISM

400-M

in Heaven", devotion to the human race. Subsidiary to these are discipline, correct thinking, and good education.

Student.—Is the uneducated man, then, in a worse condition?

Sage.—Not necessarily so. The very learned are so immersed in one system that they reject nearly all thoughts not in accord with preconceived notions. The sincere ignorant one is often able to get the truth but not able to express it. The ignorant masses generally hold in their minds the general truths of Nature, but are limited as to expression. And most of the best discoveries of scientific men have been obtained in this sub-conscious telepathic mode. Indeed, they often arrive in the learned brain from some obscure and so-called ignorant person, and then the scientific discoverer makes himself famous because of his power of expression and means for giving it out.

Student.—Does this bear at all upon the work of the Adepts of all good Lodges?

Sage.—It does. They have all the truths that could be desired, but at the same time are able to guard them from the seeking minds of those who are not yet ready to use them properly, and then touch his cogitating mind with a picture of what he seeks. He then has a "flash" of thought in the line of his deliberations, as many of them have admitted. He gives it out to the world, becomes famous, and the world wiser. This is constantly done by the Adepts, but now and then they give out larger expositions of Nature's truths, as in the case of H.P.B. This is not at first generally accepted, as personal gain and fame are not

advanced by any admission of benefit from the writings of another, but as it is done with a purpose, for the use of a succeeding century, it will do its work at the proper time.

Student.—How about the Adepts knowing what is going on in the world of thought, in the West, for instance?

Sage.—They have only to voluntarily and consciously connect their minds with those of the dominant thinkers of the day to at once discover what has been or is being worked out in thought and to review it all. This they constantly do, and as constantly incite to further elaborations or changes

400-N

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

by throwing out the suggestion in the mental plane so that seeking and receptive minds may use it.

Student.—Are there any rules, binding on all, in white magic or good occultism? I mean rules similar to the ten commandments of the Christians, or the rules for the protection of life, liberty, and property recognized by human law.

Sage.—There are such rules of the most stringent character, the breaking of which is never wiped out save by expiation. Those rules are not made up by some brain or mind, but flow from the laws of nature, of mind, and of soul. Hence they are impossible of nullification. One may break them and seem to escape for a whole life or for more than a life; but the very breaking of them sets in motion at once other causes which begin to make effects, and most unerringly those effects at last react on the violator. Karma here acts as it does elsewhere, and becomes a Nemesis who, though sometimes slow, is fate itself in its certainty.

Student.—It is not, then, the case that when an occultist violates a rule some other adept or agent starts out like a detective or policeman and brings the culprit to justice at a bar or tribunal such as we sometimes read of in the imaginative works of mystical writers or novelists?

Sage.—No, there is no such pursuit. On the contrary, all the fellow-adepts or students are but too willing to aid the offender, not in escaping punishment, but in sincerely trying to set counteracting causes in motion for the good of all. For the sin of one reacts on the whole human family. If, however, the culprit does not wish to do the amount of counteracting good, he is merely left alone to the law of nature, which is in fact that of his own inner life from which there can be no escape. In Lytton's novel, *Zanoni*, you will notice the grave Master, Mejnour, trying to aid Zanoni, even at the time when the latter was falling slowly but surely into the meshes twisted by himself that ended in his destruction. Mejnour knew the law and so did Zanoni. The latter was suffering from some former error which

he had to work out the former, if himself too stern and unkind, would later on come to the appropriate grief for such a mistake. But meanwhile he was bound to help his friend, as are all those who really believe in brotherhood.

Student.—What one of those rules in any way corresponds to “Thou shalt not steal”?

Sage.— That one which was long ago expressed by the ancient sage in the words, “Do not covet the wealth of any creature.” This is better than “Thou shalt not steal,” for you cannot steal unless you covet. If you steal for hunger you may be forgiven, but you coveted the food a purpose, just as another covets merely for the sake of possession. The wealth of others includes all their possessions, and does not mean mere money alone. Their ideas, their private thoughts, their mental forces, powers, and faculties, their psychic powers--all, indeed, on all planes that they own or have. While they in that realm are willing to give it all away, it must not be coveted by another.

You have no right, therefore, to enter into the mind of another who has not given the permission and take from him what is not yours. You become a burglar on the mental and psychic plane when you break this rule. You are forbidden taking anything for personal gain, profit, advantage, or use But you may take what is for general food, if you are far enough advanced and good enough to be able to extricate the personal element from it. This rule would, you can see, cut off all those who are well known to every observer, who want psychic powers for themselves and their own uses If such persons had those powers of inner sight and hearing that they so much want, no power could prevent them from committing theft on the unseen planes wherever they met a nature that was not protected And as most of us are very far from perfect, so far, indeed, that we must work for many lives, yet the Masters of Wisdom do not aid our defective natures in the getting of weapons that would cut our own hands For the law acts implacably, and the breaches made would find their end and result in long after years The Black Lodge, however, is very willing to let any poor,

weak, or sinful mortal get such power, because that would swell the number of victims they so much require.

Student.—Is there any rule corresponding to “Thou shalt not bear false witness”?

Sage.—Yes; the one which requires you never to inject into the brain of another a false or untrue thought. As we can project our thoughts to another’s mind, we must not throw untrue ones to another. It comes before him, and he, overcome by its strength perhaps, finds it echoing in him, and it is a false witness speaking falsely within, confusing and confounding the inner spectator who lives on thought.

Student.—How can one prevent the natural action of the mind when pictures of the

private lives of others rise before one?

Sage.—That is difficult for the run of men. Hence the mass have not the power in general; it is kept back as much as possible. But when the trained soul looks about in the realm of soul it is also able to direct its sight, and when it finds rising up a picture of what it should not voluntarily take, it turns its face away. A warning comes with all such pictures which must be obeyed. This is not a rare rule or piece of information, for there are many natural clairvoyants who know it very well, though many of them do not think that others have the same knowledge.

Student.—What do you mean by a warning coming with the picture?

Sage.—In this realm the slightest thought becomes a voice or a picture. All thoughts make pictures. Every person has his private thoughts and desires. Around these he makes also a picture of his wish for privacy, and that to the clairvoyant becomes a voice or picture of warning which seems to say it must be let alone. With some it may assume the form of a person who says not to approach, with others it will be a voice, with still others a simple but certain knowledge that the matter is sacred. All these varieties depend on the psychological idiosyncrasies of the seer.

Student.—What kind of thought or knowledge is excepted from these rules?

Sage.—General, and philosophical, religious, and moral.

CONVERSATIONS ON OCCULTISM

400-Q

That is to say, there is no law of copyright or patent which is purely human in invention and belongs to the competitive system. When a man thinks out truly a philosophical problem it is not his under the laws of nature; it belongs to all; he is not in this realm entitled to any glory, to any profit, to any private use in it. Hence the seer may take as much of it as he pleases, but must on his part not claim it or use it for himself. Similarly with other generally beneficial matters. They are for all. If a Spencer thinks out a long series of wise things good for all men, the seer can take them all. Indeed, but few thinkers do any original thinking. They pride themselves on doing so, but in fact their seeking minds go out all over the world of mind and take from those of slower movement what is good and true, and then make them their own, sometimes gaining glory, sometimes money, and in this age claiming all as theirs and profiting by it.

Student.—At a former time you spoke of entities that crowd the spaces about us. Are these all unconscious or otherwise?

Sage.—They are not all unconscious. First, there are the humdrum masses of elementals that move like nerve-currents with every motion of man, beast, or natural elements. Next are classes of those which have a peculiar power and consciousness of their own and not easily reached by any man. Then come the shades of the dead, whether mere floating shells, or animated elementals, or infused with galvanic and extraordinary action

by the Brothers of the Shadow. Last, the Brothers of the Shadow, devoid of physical bodies save in rare cases, bad souls living long in that realm and working according to their nature for no other end than evil until they are finally annihilated—they are the lost souls of Kâma Loka as distinguished from the “animated corpses” devoid of souls which live and move among men. These Black entities are the Dugpas, the Black Magicians.

Student.—Have they anything to do with the shocks,

400-R

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

knocks, bad influences, disintegration of soft material accompanied by noises more or less distinct?

Sage.—Yes, they have. Not always, of course. But where they are actually seen at the time preceding such occurrence, they are the agents.

Student.—Then I am to suppose that if such takes place with me I am the attracting person, the unfortunate channel through which they have come?

Sage.—No, you are thoroughly in error there. You are not such channel in that case. You are in fact the opposite, and the very cause for the temporary defeat of that dark entity. You have mistaken the appearance, the outer manipulation of forces, for the thing itself. If you were their channel, their agent, the cause for their coming and thus making their presence possible, there would be no noise and no explosion. They would then act in and through you for the hurt of others, silently and insidiously. They approach your sphere and attempt to make entry. The strength of your character, of your aspiration, of your life, throws them off, and they are obliged, like rain-clouds, to discharge themselves. The more strong they are, the louder will be their retreating manifestation. For the time they are temporarily destroyed or, rather, put outside the combat, and, like a war vessel, have to retire for repairs. In their case this consists in accumulating force for a new attack, there or elsewhere.

Student.—If, then, such loud explosions, with pulverization of wall-plaster and the like, take place, and such an evil entity is seen astrally, it follows that the person near whom it all occurred—if identification due to solitude is possible—was in fact the person who, by reason of inner power and opposition to the evil entity, became the cause for its bursting or temporary defeat?

Sage.—Yes, that is correct. The person is not the cause for the entity’s approach, nor its friend, but is the safeguard in fact for those who otherwise would be insidiously affected. Uninformed students are likely to argue the other way, but that will be due to want of correct knowledge. I will describe to you condensedly an actual case. Sitting at

rest on a seat, eyes closed, I saw approach one of those evil entities along the astral currents, and looking as a man. His hands like claws reached out to affect me, on this face was a devilish expression. Full of force he moved quickly up. But as I looked at him the confidence I felt and the protection about me acted as an intense shock to him, and he appeared to burst from within, to stagger, fall to pieces, and then disappeared. Just as the disintegration began, a loud noise was caused by the sudden discharge of astral electricity, causing reactions that immediately transmitted themselves into the objects in the room, until, reaching the limit of tension, they created a noise. This is just the phenomenon of thunder, which accompanies discharges in the clouds and is followed by equilibrium.

Student.—Can I carry this explanation into every objective phenomenon, say, then, of spiritualistic rappings?

Sage.—No, not to every case. It holds with many, but specially relates to the conscious entities I was speaking of. Very often the small taps and raps one hears are produced under the law referred to, but without the presence of such an entity. These are the final dissipations of collected energy. That does not always argue a present extraneous and conscious entity. But in so far as these taps are the conclusion of an operation, that is, the thunder from one astral cloud to another, they are dissipations of accumulated force. With this distinction in mind you should not be confused.

Student.—Have not colors a good deal to do with this matter?

Sage.—Yes; but just now we will not go into the question of color except to say that the evil entities referred to often assume a garb of good color, but are not able to hide the darkness that belongs to their nature.

END OF VOLUME IX

Collected Writings VOLUME IX

xxiv

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY

OF THE CHIEF EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF H. P. BLAVATSKY AND COL.
HENRY S. OLCOTT, FROM JANUARY, 1888, TO JUNE, 1888, INCLUSIVE.

(the period to which the material in the present volume belongs)

1888

Early—Friction between H. P. B. on the one hand, and Subba Row and some of his Anglo-Indian backers on the other, growing worse. They threaten to withdraw from the Society and to publish a rival magazine (*ODL.*, IV, 41).

January 10—Letter sent to H. P. B. from New York, signed by twenty prominent members protesting against some Indian pundits' opposition to the publication of *The Secret Doctrine*, then in process of preparation (*Path*, II, Feb., 1888, pp. 354-55; *Ransom*, 247).

February 22—Death of Dr. Anna Bonus Kingsford, who was born in 1846 (*AK*, 3rd ed., II, 361-62).

March—Col. H. S. Olcott is very depleted after his long trip in 1887; blood impoverished, outbreak of boils, one being of a carbuncular nature; laid up for a while with gouty rheumatism in one foot. Accepts invitation to visit General and Mrs. H. R. Morgan at Ootacamund, and is restored to much better health as a result of complete rest. While there, he buys the piece of land on which he built later on a cottage known as “Gulisthan” as a retreat for H. P. B., himself and other friends (*ODL.*, IV, 46; 50-51; *Ransom*, 246; *Theos.*, IX, Suppl., April, 1888, p. xxxiii).

April—Letter to the Editor of the New York *Path*, dated from Bombay and signed by a number of Indian pundits, protesting the ideas expressed in the letter published in *The Path* of January, 1888 (*Path*, III, June, 1888, pp. 97-98; *Ransom*, 247).

April 4—Letter from H. P. B. to William Quan Judge, granting him exclusive rights to print and publish *The Secret Doctrine* during the whole term of the copyright in the same, as agent for the Theosophical Publication Society (*Theos. Forum*, V, December, 1933).

April—A. J. Cooper-Oakley resigns from the Editorship of *The Theosophist* which he had edited during Col. Olcott's absence at Ootacamund (H. S. O. in *Theos.*, X, Suppl., Dec., 1888, p. xxviii).

April 22-23—National Convention of American Theosophists held at the Sherman House in Chicago, Ill. (*Path*, III, May, 1888, pp. 66-71; *Theos.*, IX, July, 1888, pp. 615 *et seq.*).

May 6—H. S. Olcott lectures at the Mysore Mahârâja's house (*ODL.*, IV, 49).

May—H. P. B. much improved in general health, according to Bertram Keightley (*Theos.*, IX, Suppl., May, 1888, p.xxxvii).

May 31—H. S. Olcott leaves Ooctacamund for Adyar; lectures en route at Coimbatore, Pollachi, Udamalpet and Palghat; reaches Adyar June 12th (*ODL.*, IV, 51; *Ransom*, 246; *Theos.*, IX, Suppl., July, 1888, p. xlv).

June 23—Important meeting of the Isis Branch in Paris, sale Richefeu, to revise rules and eliminate elements of discord. *Le Lotus* ceases to be the official organ of the Branch (*Le Lotus*, III, July, 1888, pp. 253-55). Considerable trouble in regard to new President (*ODL.*, IV, 56; *Ransom*, 249).

June—T. Subba Row and J. N. Cook (of London Lodge) resign membership in the Society; this is partially due to the protest published in the *The Path* of January, 1888, about Hindû views concerning the publication of *The Secret Doctrine* (*Theos.*, IX, Suppl., June, 1888, p. xli; *Ransom*, 246-47).

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

AK—*Anna Kingsford. Her Life, Letters, Diary and Work*, by Edward Maitland. 2 vols. Ill. London: George Redway, 1896. 3rd ed., J.M. Watkins, 1913.

Lotus, Le—*Revue de Hautes Études Théosophiques*, sous l'inspiration de H.P. Blavatsky. Paris. For a time the official organ of the Isis Branch of the Theosophical Society. Published from March, 1887, to March, 1889.

ODL—*Old Diary Leaves*, Henry Steel Olcott, Fourth Series, 1887-1892. London: Theos. Publ. Society; Adyar: Office of *The Theosophist*, 1910.

Path—*The Path*. A Magazine devoted to the Brotherhood of Humanity, Theosophy in America, and the Study of Occult Science, Philosophy and Aryan Literature. Published and Edited at New York by William Quan Judge. Vol. II, April 1887-March, 1888; Vol. III, April, 1888-March, 1889.

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 xiii, 591 pp.

Theos. Forum—*The Theosophical Forum*, Published under the authority of the Theosophical Society, Point Loma, California, U.S.A. New Series. Monthly. First issue publ. In September, 1929.

Theos—*The Theosophist*, published at Madras, India, beginning with October, 1879. In progress,

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



H.P. B.'s RESIDENCE 17, LANSDOWNE ROAD,
NOTTINGHILL, LONDON, ENGLAND
Picture taken in 1959, showing only minor
Alterations since 1887.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE

April 13, 1851-March 21, 1896

Photograph originally published in *The Word*, New York,
Vol. XV, April, 1912.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



DR. ANNA BONUS KINGSFORD (1846-1888)

From a photograph taken July 12, 1883. Reproduced from Isabel de Steiger's *Memorabilia*, where it is credited to Mr. Samuel Hopgood Hart.
(For biographical sketch see the Bio-Bibliographical Index)

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



H.P. BLAVATSKY

It is likely that H.P.B. was in her late thirties or early forties when this picture was taken. No definite information about this exists. It is reproduced from an original print, by courtesy of The Theosophical Society in America, Wheaton, Ill.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



ANNIE BESANT IN 1885

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



CHARLES JOHNSTON
(1867-1931)

(Courtesy Alan Denson, London, England)
(For biographical sketch see the Bio-Bibliographical Index)

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**




THOTH AND HORUS PURIFYING THE KING

From Kôm-Ombô, Egypt.

The streams are interlaced and pictured as small ansated crosses; this scene is of a similar type, but not identical With, the one mentioned by H.P.B. as being in the Temple of Philae. No reproduction of that could be found.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



ALFRED PERCY SINNETT
(1840-1921)

Reproduced from *The Theosophist*, Vol. XXX, September, 1909.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



Dr. ARCHIBALD KEIGHTLEY (*Left*) (1859-1930)
Dr. HERBERT A. W. CORYN (*Right*) (1863-1927)
Reproduced from *Theosophy*, Vol. XII, June, 1897, p. 93.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY
(1860-1945)

Reproduced from *The Theosophist*, Vol. XXX, September, 1909.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



JULIA WHARTON KEIGHTLEY
(d. 1915)

Reproduced from *The Path*, New York, Vol. IX, April, 1894, facing p.14.


Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



DON JOSE XIFRE
(1846-1920)


Reproduced from *The Theosophist*, Vol. XXXII, September, 1911.

Collected Writings **VOLUME IX**



THE GEM

Collected Writings VOLUME IX



NO MORE