



Discrimination of Spirit and Non-Spirit

[*The Theosophist*, Vol. V, No. 3(51), December, 1883, pp. 72-74; and Vol. VI, *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, pp. 5-6]

[Mohini M. Chatterji, F.T.S., translates from the original Sanskrit Sankarâchârya's celebrated Synopsis of Vedântism, entitled *Âtmânâtma-Viveka*. The text contains the following passage, in question-and-answer form:

“Q. What is *vach*?

A. That which transcends speech, in which speech resides, and which is located in *eight different centres* and has the power of speech.”

To this H. P. B. appends the following note:]

The secret *commentaries* say seven; for it does not separate the lips into the “upper” and “nether” lips. And, it adds to the seven centres the *seven passages* in the head connected with, and affected by, *vach*; namely — the mouth, the two eyes, the two nostrils and the two ears. “The left ear, eye and nostril being the messengers of the *right side of the head*; the right ear, eye and nostril — those of the left side.” Now this is purely scientific. The latest discoveries and conclusions of modern physiology have shown that the power or the faculty of human speech is located in the third frontal cavity of the left hemisphere of the brain. On the other hand, it is a well known fact that the nerve tissues inter-cross each other (decussate) in the brain in such a way that the motions of our left extremities are governed by the right hemisphere, while the motions of our right-hand limbs are subject to the left hemisphere of the brain.

THE GOD-IDEA

Babu Raj Narain Bose

[*The Theosophist*, Vol. V, No. 3(51), December, 1883, pp. 75-76; *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, Vol. VI, pp. 9-12]

[In order to understand HPB's rejoinders to the letter printed below, we have opted to print both the letter and the footnotes — Eds.-A.T.]

I deem it necessary to reply to some of your remarks on my letter published in *The Theosophist* for the current month.

You say, “Since few of us have identical beliefs and every religionist of whatever faith is firmly impressed with the truth and superiority of his own creed. . . ., the result is, sectarianism is ever kept alive.” To this my reply is: Let every religionist preach his own religion, and that which is the truest religion is sure to prevail. If religion were preached according to my plan, there would be different sects but no sectarian *animosity*. As different men have got different countenances, so there must always be different religious sects in this world. That cannot be helped.

You say: “Would our Atheists be welcome in the Brahma Mandirs?” I say no, because Atheism is no religion. It is the negation of belief. Any religionist who would discourse upon general religion would certainly be welcome.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Discrimination of Spirit and Not-Spirit	1
The God Idea	1
Glass from Space	3
Notes from the Edge of Time	5
How the Masters Approach an Aspirant	7
Madame Blavatsky on Education	7
Classification of the Principles	9
Reincarnation Revisited	17
Idiotic Schemes and Shams	19
Night before last.....	19
A Definite Philosophy	19

You say that you do not propagate your religious opinions, and that you give out your views on the subject of religion only when challenged to do so. Granted. But do you not endeavor to prevail upon people to believe in *Occultism and the existence of Spirit*? If you do not do so, what is the use of these Theosophical Societies? Is not this a kind of religious propagation?¹ Does it not lead sometimes to angry discussion like other kinds of religious propagation?

I have not the returns of the last census of Bombay at hand, nor is it easy to lay hold of them in this out-of-the-way place. Will you therefore kindly inform me of the number only of Theists in that city whom, poor men! you have put in the same category with Christians, and the percentage of crime committed by them as compared with orthodox Hindus.

You believe in a “living God in man himself,” a “divine indweller,” a “divine Presence” and not a God outside of man himself. This, as far as I understand, means that you believe in the Eternal and All-pervading Principle manifesting itself in a personal and therefore a worshipable form in the human soul. You charge us, Theists, with believing in Existence and not Presence, and represent that you, believers in the human soul as God, are real believers in the Presence. To this I answer that we go further than you in believing in Presence. We believe in a soul of the soul, in a being in whom the soul or spirit lives, moves and has its being,² in a *Sarvabhutantarâtmâ*, or Inner Soul

¹ We join issue with our respected friend here; followers of all religions can be and have always counted among their numbers students of the subject in question, namely:—Occultism.—Ed.[HPB]

² We are forced to reply to our venerable friend that if the Theists claim to go “further,” the Theosophists (of that school, at any rate, to which the writer belongs) claim to go deeper. Rejecting all Externals as true guides, they accept but the Internal, the invisible, the never to be described by any adjective or human qualification. And going deeper they reject the idea of “the soul of the soul”—anima; from which the word animal is derived. For us there is no over-soul or under-soul; but only ONE—substance: the last word being used in the sense Spinoza attached to it; calling it the ONE Existence, we cannot limit its significance and dwarf it to the qualification “over”; but we apply it to the universal, ubiquitous Presence, rejecting the word ‘Being,’ and replacing it with “All-Being.” Our Deity as the “God” of

of all things as preached by our venerable *Upanishads*.³ This we call God. He is as much the life of the soul or spirit as of the physical world. He is the life of life and the soul of the soul and is immanent to all things. He is the Spirit of Spirit, the Perfect Spirit on whom this imperfect spirit of ours always depends for its existence. That the imperfect depends always on the perfect is an axiomatic truth.

You say that Theosophy is the informing life of every religion. How can it be so when its principal article of belief is that God is impersonal and has no *gunas* or attributes?⁴ The belief in one Personal God or Theism is the informing soul of every religion. Every religion recognizes a Personal Divinity—I observe that men, who do not believe in God, are led as it were by a curse of Nature to substitute infinitely less worthy objects of reverence or adoration in

Spinoza and of the true Adwaitee—neither thinks, nor creates, for it is All-thought and All-creation. We say with Spinoza—who repeated in another key but what the Esoteric doctrine of the *Upanishads* teaches: ‘Extension is visible Thought; Thought is invisible Extension.’ For Theosophists of our school the Deity is a UNITY in which all other units in their infinite variety merge and from which they are indistinguishable—except in the prism of theistic Maya. The individual drops of the curling waves of the universal Ocean have no independent existence. In short, while the Theist proclaims his God a gigantic universal BEING, the Theosophist declares with Heraclitus, as quoted by a modern author, that the ONE Absolute is not Being—but becoming: the ever-developing, cyclic evolution, the Perpetual Motion of Nature visible and invisible—moving, and breathing even during its long Pralayaic Sleep.—Ed.[HPB]

³ It is easy to prove that the *Upanishads* do not teach belief in a *personal* God—with humanly conceived attributes, etc. *Iswar* is not mentioned in the *Upanishads* as a personal noun. On the other hand we see *Guhya Ade a*, the strictest preservation of the secrecy of the doctrines, constantly urged, the *Upanishads*, showing in their very name that the doctrines taught were never revealed but to the Initiates. At the very outset the seeker after knowledge of Brahma is enjoined to repair to a guru (*tad vijijñâsaratham sa guru mevâvigachchet*), which is simply unmeaning if a literal interpretation of the text was capable of conveying the intended sense. This quotation from the *Upanishad*, we may add, is adopted by the Brahmos of the *Adi Samaj* and finds a place in their *Brahma Dharma Grantha*, compiled by the Pradhanacharya.—Ed.[HPB]

⁴ We may be allowed to point out that we do not maintain that Parabrahm is absolutely without *any guna*, for *Presence* itself is a *guna*, but that it is beyond the three *gunas*—*Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*.—Ed.[HPB]

His place such as Humanity—as is the case with Positivists, departed Spirits—as is the case with some Spiritualists, or Human Reason or Logos¹—as is the case with you, Theosophists.

You say that the Adi Brahma Samaj movement has not succeeded, because the principal members of the Samaj have not the *Yoga* power. I need tell you that these members believe that the highest *Yoga* is the concentration of mind upon God even amidst the transaction of worldly affairs. This *Yoga* has been illustrated by a sloka given in my “Superiority of Hinduism,” containing the beautiful comparison of the real *yogi* to a female dancer with a pitcher full of water upon her head, singing and dancing according to the strictest rules of music, but still preventing the pitcher from falling down. This best of all *yogas*, the real Raj yoga, is to be attained by long practice requiring constant and tremendous exercise of will power as was done by Rajah Janaka.

But do not think, therefore, that I do not believe in theosophic *yoga* apart from its, what I think, unnatural alliance with Agnosticism or Buddhism. Theosophic *yoga* has its use.² It enables us to show that the people of Asia are possessed of scientific knowledge to which European science is as nothing. I cannot disbelieve in the marvelous effects of such *yoga*. I cannot discredit the testimony on this point of such honest and intelligent individuals as yourself, Messrs. Hume, Sinnett and Olcott, Captain Osborne and Col. Wade who lived in the Court of Runjeet Sing and my personal friend, Babu Akshaya Kumar Datta, former Editor of the *Tatvabodhini Patrika*, who collected with so much care the evidence about the Sunderban *yogi*. I admit the importance of theosophic *yoga*, but it would prove a calamity to India if it leads to a general exodus of most of our best men to the jungles. It would be adding another serious evil to those under which India

¹ When the term Logos, Verbum, Vach, the mystic *divine voice* of every nation and philosophy comes to be better understood, then only will come the first glimmering of the Dawn of one Universal Religion. *Logos* was never *human* reason with us.—Ed.[HPB]

² We are afraid some misapprehension exists in our correspondent's mind as to what “Theosophic Yoga” is. Rajah Janaka was a Theosophic Yogi. See in this connection Sankara's Commentaries on *Bhagavad-Gitâ*.—Ed.

is already groaning. I think the highest *yoga* is best practiced at home.

With reference to your allusion to the supposed future of the Adi Brahma Samaj³ movement, allow me to inform you that the Adi Brahma Samaj is no *organized* church like the Brahma Samaj of India or the Sadharan Brahma Samaj and has no muster roll of members. All educated men, who believe in a formless God, but yet do not think it proper to wound the feelings of parents and other dear relatives by diverging widely from prevailing customs and usages, are members of the Adi Brahma Samaj.⁴ They form a very considerable section of the community. The orthodox Hari Sabhas of Bengal have been evidently affected by the influence of the Adi Brahma Samaj. Their proceedings are now-a-days held according to its model, and the discourses delivered in them are gradually becoming more and more theistic than before.

My health does not unfortunately permit me to continue this very interesting discussion further. I therefore conclude it on my part with this letter.

DEOGARH, August 10th, 1883.

=====

Glass from Space

NASA-supported researchers have discovered that glass formed in space has remarkable properties.

April 14, 2003: It's easy: mix together some materials like sand, limestone and soda. Heat them above 2000° F. Then cool


³ Our esteemed correspondent misunderstands us. We never spoke of the “Adi Brahma Samaj,” of which we know next to nothing, but of the spurious Brahma Samaj calling itself *New Dispensation* where all is to be taken on faith and the Universal Infallibility is claimed to have taken its Headquarters in the person of Babu Keshub Chunder Sen who has now come to comparing himself publicly—nay with identifying himself—with Jesus Christ. Again—the Sadharan Brahma Samaj, a body whose members—all those we have met, at any rate—scoff at the idea of *yoga* powers and laugh at the word phenomenon.—Ed.[HPB]

⁴ Are we to understand that when the “parents and other dear relations” of the present generation will drop off the scene, the Adi Brahma Samaj will itself drop off the sphere of activity as an effete anachronism? — Ed.[HPB]

the incandescent liquid carefully so that crystals cannot form.

That's how you make glass.

Craftsmen on Earth have followed this basic recipe for millennia. It works. "Now we know it works even better in space," says glass and ceramics expert Delbert Day, who has been experimenting with glass melts on space shuttles over the past twenty years. Day is the Curators' Professor Emeritus of Ceramic Engineering at the University of



Missouri-Rolla.

Going into those first experiments, he says, he expected to end up with a purer glass. That's because

on Earth, the melts--the molten liquid from which glass is formed--must be held in some kind of container. That's a problem. "At high temperatures," says Day, "these glass melts are very corrosive toward any known container." As the melt attacks and dissolves the crucible, the melt--and thus the glass--becomes contaminated.

In micro-gravity, though, you don't need a container.

Above: Steel balls bounce on flat plates of titanium alloy, metallic glass, and stainless steel. The ball bouncing on metallic glass keeps going for a remarkably long time.

In Day's initial experiments, the melt — a molten droplet about 1/4 inch in diameter — was held in place inside a hot furnace simply by the pressure of sound waves emitted by an acoustic levitator.

With that acoustic levitator, explains Day, "we could melt and cool and melt and cool a molten droplet without letting it touch anything." As Day had hoped, containerless processing produced a better glass. To his surprise, though, the glass was of even higher quality than theory had predicted.

When most people think of glass, they think of that transparent stuff in window-panes. But glass doesn't have to be transparent nor is it always found in windows. Among researchers there's a different definition: "glass" is a solid material with an amorphous internal structure. The atoms in solids are usually arranged in regular, predictable patterns, like bricks fitted into a wall. But if the atoms are just jumbled together in a disorganized way, like bricks dumped on the ground... that's glass.

The window glass that we're so familiar with is made mostly of silica--a compound of silicon and oxygen. It's essentially melted sand. But in theory, a melt of any chemical composition can produce a glass as long as the melt can be cooled quickly enough that the atoms don't have time to hook themselves up into patterns, or crystals.

In Earth-orbit, it turns out, these molten liquids don't crystallize as easily as they do on Earth. It's easier for glass to form. So not only can you make glass that's less contaminated, you can also form it from a wider variety of melts.

But why is that important? What's wrong with glass made of silica?

For windows silica is just fine. But glass made from other chemical compositions offers a panoply of unexpected properties. For example, there are "bioactive glasses" that can be used to repair human bones. These glasses eventually dissolve when their work is done. On the other hand, Day has developed glasses that are so insoluble in the body that they are being used to treat cancer by delivering high doses of radiation directly to a tumor site.

Another example: Glass made of metal can be remarkably strong and corrosion-resistant. And you don't need to machine it into the precise, intricate shapes needed, say, for a motor. You can just mold or cast it.

Also intriguing to space researchers is fluoride glass. A blend of zirconium, barium, lanthanum, sodium and aluminum, this type of glass (also known as "ZBLAN") is a hundred times more transparent than silica-based glass. It would be exceptional for fiber optics.

A fluoride fiber would be so transparent, says Day, that light shone into one end, say, in New York City, could be seen at the other end as far away as Paris. With silicon glass fibers, the light signal degrades along the way.

Unfortunately, fluoride glass fibers are very difficult to produce on Earth. The melts tend to crystallize before glass can form.

The reason, says Day, is that gravity causes convection or mixing in a melt. In effect, gravity "stirs" it, and, in a process known as [shear thinning](#), the melt becomes more fluid. This same process works in peanut butter: the faster you stir it, the more easily it moves.

In melts that are more fluid, like those stirred by gravity, the atoms move rapidly, so they can get into geometric arrangements more quickly. In thicker, more viscous melts, the atoms move more slowly. It's harder for regular patterns to form. It's more likely that the melt will produce a glass.

In microgravity, Day believes, melts may be more viscous than they are on Earth.

While this theory has not yet been confirmed, some experimental results suggest that it is correct. NASA researcher Dennis Tucker worked with fluoride melts on the KC-135, a plane that provides short bursts of near zero gravity interspersed with periods of high gravity.

"He did some glass-melting experiments, trying to pull thin fibers out of melts," recounts Day. "During the low-gravity portion of the plane's flight, when *g* was almost zero, the fibers came out with no trouble. But during the double-gravity

portion of the plane's flight, the fiber that he was pulling totally crystallized."

That result, says Day, could be explained by shear thinning. "A melt in low gravity doesn't experience much shear. But as you increase *g*, there'll be more and more movement in the melt." Shear stresses increase. The effective viscosity of the melt decreases. Crystallization becomes more likely.

Day is currently planning his next experiment in space — onboard the International Space Station — which he hopes will confirm his ideas. He'll be melting and cooling identical glass samples in the same way on Earth and in microgravity. Then he'll count the number of crystals that appear in each sample. If shear thinning exists, he says, there will be fewer crystals in the space-melted samples than in the ones produced on Earth.

Eventually, Day hopes to take these lessons learned from space and apply them to glass production on the ground. Metallic glasses. Bioactive glasses. Super-clear fiber optics. The possible applications go on and on.....

Credits & Contacts

Author: [Karen Miller](#), [Dr. Tony Phillips](#)

Responsible NASA official: [Ron Koczor](#)

Curator: [Bryan Walls](#)

Media Relations: [Steve Roy](#)

http://science.nasa.gov/headlines/y2003/14apr_zeroglass.htm?list738761

NOTES FROM THE EDGE OF TIME

When Samar Pungava Sastri declared in his article, "Yoga and Kalpa," that the administration of certain compounds and preparations would give one the power to sustain his body through all eternity, Madame Blavatsky replied:

This, the Mahatmas deny most emphatically. To make one and the same body last eternally, *i.e.*, to prevent the tissues from wearing out is as impossible as the communication of perpetual motion to

any finite object in nature. Though *per se* perpetual motion is a fact, the eternal duration of the materials to which it may be imparted is unthinkable.

Along the same line the author continues:

[“Respiration and diet . . . cannot . . . give body that eternal immortality which, I believe, is an essential requisite of Yogic success, and which *Agastya Bhagavan* says, can be secured only by Kalpa¹ administration accompanied by *Raja Yoga*.”]

And HPB replies:

What *Agastya Bhagavan* meant was not the eternal duration of any physical body, but of the *inner*, divine man in his *individuality*; and thus by avoiding reincarnations in other personalities, the *unbroken* preservation of one’s own **higher personality**. This may be reached only by such great adepts as he was himself.

[“ . . . one may thus live crores of Yugas.”]

Not quite so. “Crores of Yugas” in one’s self-conscious “inner self,” not in one and the same physical body.

[*Agastya* speaks of “the *seven times* born *Brahma Garbha*”]

When Mr. Sinnett’s *Esoteric Buddhism*, and “Fragments of Occult Truth” are read and comprehended, it will be easy to understand that the “seven births” or transformations refer to the seven births in the *seven root races*. Every such birth being the key-note struck for other and subsequent births in sub-races, each key-note resounding in a higher key than the preceding one on the scale of tones; or, in other words, every new *root-birth* carrying the individuality higher and higher until it reaches the *seventh root-race*, which will bring man finally to the highest, eternal

¹ “Kalpa” in this usage denotes a preparation or compound — not a cycle. The writer of the article may have misunderstood the usage, for esoterically it might be intended to have a cyclic meaning. The remainder of HPB’s comments on this person’s article show how far off the mark he was in catching the real meaning!

Buddhaship or “*Brahma Garbha*” in a degree corresponding to that he will have acquired by his enlightenment during his lives on earth.

[*Agastya* further says: “In the beginning it was light. In its fiery next birth it became blue. In its mysterious third, it became red. In the fourth it got heated and became white. Springing then, it became yellow. In its next birth its color was that of the feathery peacock. In its seventh and last, it became, indeed, an egg-colored crystal.”]

The meaning of this is simple enough to him who has studied the theory of rebirths in the Esoteric doctrine. This gradation and change of colours refers to our physical and moral constitution on

(a) the various seven planets and

(b) in the seven root races.

- Planet A, corresponds to pure *light*—the essence of man’s primeval body when he is all spiritual;
- on planet B man becomes objective—assumes definite colour;
- on C, he becomes still more physical—hence red, the red-earth or Adam Kadmon, being the material acquired by the monad in the preceding world prior to being developed as man—on this Earth;
- on planet D, white, the colour containing an equal proportion of spirit and matter;
- on E, he is yellow—(relating to the Yogi’s robe) more spiritual;
- on F, he is fast approaching “the peacock” colour, that bird being the emblem and *vahana* of *Saraswati*, the goddess of universal occult wisdom;
- while in the seventh and last birth man’s aura is compared to that of an egg-coloured crystal — pure crystal-line, purity being the attribute of *God-Man*.

How the Masters approach an Aspirant

In the following letter to W. T. Brown, the process of approaching an earnest pilgrim is described:

What Damodar told you at Poona is true. We approach nearer and nearer to a person as he goes on preparing himself for the same. You first saw us in visions, then in *astral forms*, though very often not recognized, then in body at a short distance from you. Now you see me in my own physical body¹ so close to you as to enable you to give to your countrymen the assurance that you are from personal knowledge as sure of our existence as you are of your own. Whatever may happen, remember that you will be watched and rewarded in proportion to your zeal and work for the cause of *Humanity*²

Also in these visits by Master K.H. a letter to Col. Olcott was left:

SINCE the commencement of your probationary term in America, you have had much to do with me, tho' your imperfect development has often made you mistake me for Atrya, and often to fancy your own mind at work when it was mine trying to influence and to talk with yours. Of course, by your own canons of evidence, you have not until now been a thoroughly qualified witness, since we have never previously —to your knowledge — met in the flesh. But at last you are, and our object in view in my making the journey from the Ashram to Lahore was to give you this last substantial proof. You have not only seen and conversed with, but touched me, my hand has pressed yours, and the K.H. of fancy becomes the K \triangle of fact. Your skeptical action, often running into extreme conservatism — perhaps the very last trait that the careless would suggest of you — has seriously and constantly impeded your inner unfolding. It has made you

¹ [That is to say I (W.T.Brown) would have seen him if I had turned my head.]

² We should keep in mind that these grand Humans are not a 19th century phenomenon only, but are just as active in 2003. As indicated, they respond to the conditions set up by the Pilgrim. The battle plan is clearly set forth in *The Voice of the Silence*.

suspicious — sometimes cruelly so — of Upasika, of Borg, of Djual-K. even of Damodar and D. Nath, whom you love as sons. This meeting of ours should radically change the state of your mind. Should it not, so much the worse for your future; truth never comes, burglar-like, thro' barred windows and iron-sheathed doors.

I came to you not alone of my own accord and wish, but also by order of the Maha Chohan, to whose insight the future lies like an open page. At New York you demanded of M. an objective proof that his visit to you was not a maya — and he gave it³; unasked, I give you the present one: tho' I pass out of your sight this note will be to you the reminder of our conferences. I now go to young Mr Brown to try his intuitiveness. Tomorrow night when the camp is quiet and the worst of the emanations from your audience have passed away, I shall visit you again for a longer conversation, as you must be forewarned against certain things in the future. Fear not and doubt not as you have feared and doubted at supper last night: the first month of the coming year of your era will have hardly dawned when two more of the 'enemies' will have passed away. Ever be vigilant, zealous and judicious; for remember that the usefulness of the Theosophical Society largely depends upon your exertions, and that our blessings follow its suffering 'Founders' and all who help on their work.

K.H.

***MADAME BLAVATSKY ON EDUCATION***

In the following book review an occult view of education is set forth.

MORAL EDUCATION BY PROF. BUCHANAN⁴

³ 'Objective proof' refers to the visit of the Master M. to Colonel Olcott in New York, described in *Old Diary Leaves, First Series*, pp. 379-80. The 'objective proof' is the fehta or turban, now at Adyar, which Master M. left with the Colonel as a proof that his visit was not a 'Maya' but was a reality.

⁴ *Moral Education: Its Laws and Methods*. Governments, Churches and Colleges for many thousand years have strived in vain to conquer

[*The Theosophist*, Vol. V, December, 1883, p. 101]

It affords us real pleasure to give an old and respected friend a greeting through the new edition of his valuable work—Professor Buchanan's latest thoughts on a complete scheme of education. This learned gentleman, as our readers may recollect, is the discoverer in the western world of that mysterious power latent in man, which has been further enlarged upon by Prof. Denton in his *Soul of Things*. It is Professor Buchanan who is the real founder of the Science of Psychometry. The present work shows more than ever that like a few other spiritually wise men, the Professor does not feel himself at ease in the broad seat of modern civilization; he seems to have lost his way in the jungle of western materialism, but his brave spirit is struggling hard for the welfare of his race, who seem to be even unconscious of their degradation. He has hit upon the real source of danger that hangs so gloomily over the Western world threatening it with moral and spiritual ruin:

The cultivation of mere intellect, as the means of material advancement, leaving out the higher nature of man to go to seed, utterly untended and uncared for.

The whole system of modern education is entirely at fault and the result is the production of ill-shapen monstrosities. Education is the attempt to realize the harmony between nature and man. It is to find out the real aim and object of life and when found to render them an unswerving and life-long devotion. Education is the acquirement of the capacity of enjoying life to the fullest extent, its want is suicide, partial or complete. Professor Buchanan's ideal lies in the same direction as our own.

"A satisfactory knowledge," says the author, "of the psychic and physiological functions of life and their definite

crime, disease and misery — a new method must therefore be adopted — if that method can be found in this volume, does it not indicate a better future for humanity? By Joseph Rodes Buchanan, M.D., New York

association with the brain and body and laws of interaction would necessarily indicate the laws of their development. That development is education. . . ."

[*Introd.*, p. 2.]

In this present juncture when a commission is embarked on a perilous voyage for the discovery of a new and sounder basis for education in this country, Prof. Buchanan's work possesses a peculiar value and interest. Before the mould is prepared upon the western model for casting the minds of our future men and women, it is profitable to consider what competent experts declare as to the value of that model. Prof. Buchanan after half a century's experience delivers his opinion thus:—

There seems to be nothing in existence at present on a large scale in the leading institutions which can be properly called a *liberal education* for that which makes the most imposing claims to be recognised as liberal education in the universities appears, when viewed from the standpoint of anthropology, not only lame, feeble, and defective in the *most essential* elements of a liberal education, but positively *illiberal* in its contractile influence upon the intellect and soul, as well as its degenerative influence upon the body. [Chap. I, pp. 2-3.]

The eminent Italian Professor, Signor Angelo de Gubernatis bears his testimony to the same effect:—

Under the present system the university is too widely estranged from everyday life, and too indifferent to it. Where vital force should be most felt it is wholly lacking. Students enter the universities and issue therefrom in much the same manner as did the prophet Jonah enter and come forth from the gloomy recesses of the whale. They go there to learn the mysteries of science, but of the science of life, by far the most important of all, they come away ignorant. One student studies four years, another five, another six; but they are all equally ignorant of the art of living. The university should properly be the *mother of genius and of character*; it is instead merely the censor for a certain number of years of a crowd of boys, who

are forced to cheat at the examinations in order to rise from grade to grade till the desired doctor's vote is obtained. Then they are all obliged to feed together like sheep in a pasture; the examinations are the same for all; votes are cast with the same judgment, or rather lack of judgment, since *the best parrot of the class* can pass the most brilliant examination, and consequently gain the vote, while the greatest genius may perhaps lose the contest, disheartened by the trying formalities of the proceedings. It is never taken into account that one student might perhaps merit the title of doctor after only a month of trial, while another might fail to deserve it even at the expiration of twenty years. Should there be a few intellects more active than those around them, this discipline speedily brings them to the common level. . . . At present there is almost no intercourse between the university and the world without, and while from within it appears to be a great institution, outside its walls its influence is unfelt.

It is needless to multiply instances. Every thoughtful observer has found that the present pernicious system of pampering the intellect to the utter starvation of the other faculties can lead to no good result — not even lead the much favoured one to the highest pitch of development it is capable of attaining. Professor Buchanan, a student of the true science of man, has put forward a system of education which is as scientific as beneficial. Education naturally admits of division into five classes, in accordance with the different classes of faculties to be dealt with.

- (1) Physiological development, aiming [at] the formation of the manly, healthy constitution capable of lasting a hundred years and competent to enjoy life and make it a source of benefit to humanity.
- (2) Industrial Education, which alone can lead to the disappearance of those unproductive classes, now preying upon the life-blood of society like vampires.

- (3) Medical Education, supplying the people with means to stamp out diseases at their first approach and eradicate our splendid heritage of diseases.
- (4) Moral or Religious Education, whereby the life secured by the other three kinds of education, is made worth living.
- (5) And lastly comes Intellectual Education, which now holds its revels on the ruin and degradation of man.

The scheme is complete but it is likely to provoke a sneering smile on the self-satisfied dogmatic lip, as being quite utopian. Life is not long enough, it may be urged, for such elaborate training. But the utter silliness of such objection has been conclusively shown by the learned Professor. The first eighteen years of life after the first dawn of intelligence is quite enough for the whole curriculum being gone through. We heartily commend this able and original work to our readers. Let it not be taken as unforgivable sin that the book has come into the world a little too soon. It will be at all events one of the necessary missing-links in the evolution of human thought and institutions.



Classification of "Principles"

[T. Subba Row, in what seemed a Brahminical effort to call into question the teachings from the Master given thru HPB received this rejoinder from her in defense of the Work. The specific paragraph in his otherwise excellent Bhagavad Gita lectures which drew forth from HPB this article reads:

Before I proceed further, let me tell you that I do not mean to adopt the sevenfold classification of man that has up to this time been adopted in Theosophical writings generally. Just as I would classify the principles in man, I would classify the principles in the solar system and in the cosmos. There is a certain amount of similarity and the law of correspondence — as it is called by some writers — whatever may be the reason, — is the law which

obtains in a good many of the phenomena of nature, and very often by knowing what happens in the case of the microcosm, we are enabled to infer what takes place in that of the macrocosm. Now as regards the number of principles and their relation between themselves, this sevenfold classification which I do not mean to adopt, seems to me to be a very unscientific and misleading one. No doubt the number seven seems to play an important part in the cosmos, though it is neither a power nor a spiritual force; but it by no means necessarily follows that in every case we must adopt that number. What an amount of confusion has this seven-fold classification given rise to! These seven principles, as generally enumerated, do not correspond to any natural lines of cleavage, so to speak, in the constitution of man. And what is more, this sevenfold classification is almost conspicuous by its absence in many of our Hindu books. At any rate a considerable portion of it is almost unintelligible to Hindu minds; and so it is better to adopt the time-honored classification of four principles.”

Madame Blavatsky takes up the various points one by one — often quoting Subba Row’s past writings in support of the seven principles:]

[*The Theosophist*, Vol. VIII, No. 91, April, 1887, pp. 448-456]

In a most admirable lecture by Mr. T. Subba Row on the *Bhagavad Gita*, published in the February number of *The Theosophist*, the lecturer deals, incidentally as I believe, with the question of septenary “principles” in the Kosmos and Man. The division is rather criticized, and the grouping hitherto adopted and favoured in theosophical teachings is resolved into one of *Four*.

This criticism has already given rise to some misunderstanding, and it is argued by some that a slur is thrown on the original teachings. This *apparent* disagreement with one whose views are rightly held as almost decisive on occult matters in our Society is certainly a dangerous handle to give to opponents who are ever on the alert to detect and blazon forth contradictions and inconsistencies in our philosophy. Hence I feel it my duty to show that there is in reality *no* inconsistency between Mr. Subba Row’s views and our own in the question of the septenary division; and to show,

(a) That the lecturer was perfectly well acquainted with the septenary division

before he joined the Theosophical Society;

- (b) That he knew it was the teaching of old Aryan “philosophers [who] have associated seven *occult* powers with the seven principles” in the Macrocosm and the Microcosm (see the end of this article); and
- (c) That from the beginning he had objected — not to the classification but to the form in which it was expressed.

Therefore, when he calls the division “unscientific and misleading,” and adds that “this sevenfold classification is almost conspicuous by its absence in many [not *all*?] of our Hindu books,” etc., and that it is better to adopt the time-honoured classification of four principles, Mr. Subba Row must mean only some special orthodox books, as it would be impossible for him to contradict himself in such a conspicuous way.

A few words of explanation, therefore, will not be altogether out of place. For the matter of being “conspicuous by its absence” in Hindu books, the said classification is as conspicuous by its absence in Buddhist books. This, for a reason transparently clear: it was always esoteric; and as such, rather inferred than openly taught. That it is “misleading” is also perfectly true; for the great feature of the day — materialism — has led the minds of our Western theosophists into the prevalent habit of viewing the seven principles as distinct and self existing *entities*, instead of what they are — namely, *upadhis* and correlating states — three *upadhis*, basic groups, and four principles.

As to being “unscientific,” the term can be only attributed to a *lapsus linguae*, and in this relation let me quote what Mr. Subba Row wrote about a year *before he joined* the Theosophical Society in one of his ablest articles, “Brahmanism on the Sevenfold Principle in Man,”¹ the best

¹ The essay of T. Subba Row quoted from by H.P.B. was originally published in *The Theosophist*, Vol. III, January, 1882, pp. 93-99, with additional

review that ever appeared of the “Fragments of Occult Truth”—since embodied in *Esoteric Buddhism*. Says the author:—

I have carefully examined it [the teaching], and find that the results arrived at (in the Buddhist doctrine) do not seem to differ much from the conclusions of our Aryan philosophy, though our mode of stating the arguments may differ in form.

Having enumerated after this the “three primary causes” which bring the human being into existence — *i.e.*, Parabrahman, Shakti and Prakriti — he explains:

Now, according to the adepts of ancient Aryavarta, *seven principles* are evolved out of these *three* primary entities. Algebra teaches us that the number of *combinations* of *n* things taken *one* at a time, *two* at a time, *three* at a time, and so forth = $2^n - 1$.

Applying this formula to the present case, the number of entities evolved from different combinations of these three primary causes amounts to $2^3 - 1 = 8 - 1 = 7$.

As a general rule, whenever seven *entities* are mentioned in the ancient occult sciences of India, in any connection whatsoever, you must suppose that those seven entities came into existence from *three primary entities*; and that these three entities again are evolved out of a *single* entity or MONAD. (See *Five Years of Theosophy*, p. 160.)

This is quite correct, from the occult standpoint, and also kabbalistically, when one looks into the question of the *seven* and *ten* Sephiroths, and the *seven* and *ten* Rishis, Manus, etc. It shows that in sober truth there is not nor can there be any fundamental disagreement between the esoteric philosophy of the *Trans- and Cis-Himalayan Adepts*. The reader is

notes and footnotes by H.P.B. herself. The title of this essay was: “The Aryan-Arhat Esoteric Tenets on the Sevenfold Principle in Man.” It was reprinted in *The Aquarian Theosophist, Supplement #3*, Jan. 17, 2003, pp. 3-18. It also appears in *Five Years of Theosophy*, pp. 153-184 under the title, “Brahmanism on the Sevenfold Principle In Man,”

referred, moreover, to the earlier pages of the above-mentioned article, in which it is stated that

. the knowledge of *the occult powers of nature* possessed by the inhabitants of the lost Atlantis was learnt by the ancient adepts of India and was appended by them to the esoteric doctrine taught by the residents of the sacred Island [now the Gobi desert]¹. The Tibetan adepts, however [their precursors of Central Asia], have not accepted this addition. . . . (pp. 155-56).

But this difference between the two doctrines does not include the septenary division, as it was universal after it had originated with the Atlanteans, who, as the Fourth Race, were of course an earlier race than the Fifth—the Aryan.

Thus, from the purely metaphysical standpoint, the remarks made on the Septenary Division in the “*Bhagavad-Gita*” Lecture hold good to-day, as they did five or six years ago in the article “Brahmanism on the Sevenfold Principle in Man,” their apparent discrepancy notwithstanding. For purposes of purely theoretical esotericism, they are as valid in Buddhist as they are in Brahmanical philosophy. Therefore, when Mr. Subba Row proposes to hold to “the time-honoured classification of four principles” in a lecture on a Vedanta work—the Vedantic classification, however, dividing man into “*five kosas*” (sheaths) and the *Atma* (the six *nominally* of course),² he simply shows thereby that he desires to remain strictly within theoretical and metaphysical, and also orthodox computations of the same. This is how I understand his words, at any rate. For the *Taraka Raja-Yoga* classification is again *three upadhis*, the *Atma* being the fourth principle, and no *upadhi*, of course, as it is

¹ See *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. I, p. 600, and the appendices by H.P.B. to “The Aryan-Arhat Esoteric Tenets on the Sevenfold Principle in Man.”

² This is the division given to us by Mr. Subba Row. See *Five Years of Theosophy*, pp. 185-86, article signed T.S.

one with Parabrahm. This is again shown by himself in a little article called "Septenary Division in Different Indian Systems."¹

Why then should not "Buddhist" Esotericism, so-called, resort to such a division? It is perhaps "misleading"—that is admitted; but surely it cannot be called "unscientific." I will even permit myself to call that adjective a thoughtless expression, since it has been shown to be on the contrary very "scientific" by Mr. Subba Row himself; and quite mathematically so, as the afore-quoted algebraic demonstration of the same proves it. I say that the division is due to nature herself pointing out its necessity in kosmos and man; just because the number seven is "a power, and a spiritual force" in its combination of *three* and *four*, of the triangle and the quaternary. It is no doubt far more convenient to adhere to the fourfold classification in a metaphysical and synthetical sense, just as I have adhered to the threefold classification — of body, soul and spirit — in *Isis Unveiled*, because had I then adopted the septenary division, as I have been compelled to do later on for purposes of strict analysis, no one would have understood it, and the multiplication of principles, instead of throwing light upon the subject, would have introduced endless confusion. But now the question has changed, and the position is different. We have *unfortunately* — for it was premature — opened a chink in the Chinese wall of esotericism, and we cannot now close it again, even if we would. I for one had to pay a heavy price for the indiscretion, but I will not shrink from the results.

I maintain then, that when once we pass from the plane of pure subjective reasoning on esoteric matters to that of practical demonstration in Occultism, wherein each principle and attribute has to be analysed and defined in its application to the phenomena of daily and especially of *post-mortem* life, the sevenfold

classification is the right one. For it is simply a convenient division which prevents in no wise the recognition of but *three* groups — which Mr. Subba Row calls "four principles associated with four *upadhis*, which are further associated in their turn with four distinct states of consciousness."^{2*} This is the *Bhagavad-Gita* classification, it appears; but not that of the Vedanta, nor — what the Raja-Yogis of the *pre-Aryasangha* schools and of the *Mahayana* system held to, and still hold beyond the Himalayas, and their system is almost identical with the *Taraka Raja-Yoga* — the difference between the latter and the Vedanta classification having been pointed out to us by Mr. Subba Row in his little article on the "Septenary Division in Different Indian Systems." The Taraka Raja-Yogis recognize only *three upadhis* in which *Atma* may work, which, in India, if I mistake not, are the *Jagrata*, or waking state of consciousness (corresponding to the *Sthulopadhi*); the *Svapna*, or dreaming state (in *Sukshmapadhi*), and the *Sushupti*, or causal state, produced by, and through *Karanopadhi*, or what we call *Buddhi*. But then, in transcendental states of *Samadhi*, the body with its *linga sarira*, the *vehicle* of the life-principle, is entirely left out of consideration: the three states of consciousness are made to refer only to the three (with *Atma* the fourth) principles which remain after death. And here lies the real key to the septenary division of man, the three principles coming in as an addition only during his life.

As in the Macrocosm, so in the Microcosm, analogies hold good throughout nature. Thus the universe, our solar system, our earth down to man, are to be regarded as

² A crowning proof of the fact that the division is arbitrary and varies with the schools it belongs to, is in the words published in "Personal and Impersonal God" by Mr. Subba Row, where he states that ". . . we have six states of consciousness, either objective or subjective . . . and a state of perfect unconsciousness. . . ." (See *Five Years of Theosophy*, pp. 200-201). Of course those who do not hold to the old school of Aryan and Arhat Adepts are in no way bound to adopt the septenary classification.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 185-86.

all equally possessing a septenary constitution—*four* superterrestrial and superhuman, so to say; *three* objective and astral. In dealing with the special case of man, only, there are two standpoints from which the question may be considered. Man in *incarnation* is certainly made up of seven principles, if we so term the seven states of his material, astral, and spiritual framework, which are all on different planes. But if we classify the principles according to the seat of the four degrees of consciousness, these *upadhis* may be reduced to four groups.^{1*} Thus his consciousness, never being centred in the second or third principles—both of which are composed of states of matter (or rather of “substance”) on different planes, each corresponding to one of the planes and principles in Kosmos—is necessary to form links between the first, fourth, and fifth principles, as well as subserving certain vital and psychic phenomena. These latter may be conveniently classified with the physical body under one head, and laid aside during trance (*Samadhi*), as after death, thus leaving only the traditional *exoteric* and metaphysical *four*. Any charge of contradictory teaching, therefore, based on this simple fact, would obviously be wholly invalid; the classification of principles as septenary or quaternary depending wholly on the standpoint from which they are regarded, as said. It is purely a matter of choice which classification we adopt. Strictly speaking, however, *occult*—as also profane—physics would favour the septenary one for these reasons.²

¹ Mr. Subba Row’s argument that in the matter of the three divisions of the body “we may make any number of divisions . . . [and] may as well enumerate nerve-force, blood, and bones,” is not valid, I think. Nerve-force—well and good, though it is one with the life principle and proceeds from it; as to blood, bones, etc., these are objective material things, and one with, and inseparable from the human body; while all the other six principles are in their *Seventh—the body*—purely *subjective* principles, and therefore all denied by material science, which ignores them.

² In that most admirable article of his, “Personal and Impersonal God”—one which has attracted much attention in the Western Theosophical circles, Mr. Subba Row says, “Just as a human being is composed of seven principles, differentiated

There are *six* Forces in Nature: this in Buddhism as in Brahmanism, whether exoteric or esoteric, and the seventh—the *all-Force*, or the absolute Force, which is the synthesis of all. Nature again in her constructive activity strikes the key-note to this classification in more than one way. As stated in the third aphorism of *Sankhya-karika* of *Prakriti*—“the root and substance of all things,” she (*Prakriti*, or nature) is no production, but herself a *producer* of *seven* things, “which, produced by her, become all in their turn producers.” Thus all the liquids in nature begin, when separated from their parent mass, by becoming a spheroid (a drop); and when the globule is formed, and it falls, the impulse given to it transforms it, when it touches ground, almost invariably into an equilateral triangle (or three), and then into an *hexagon*, after which out of the corners of the latter begin to be formed squares or cubes as plane figures. Look at the *natural* work of nature, so to speak, her artificial, or helped production—the prying into her occult workshop by science. Behold the coloured rings of a soap bubble, and those produced by polarized light. The rings obtained, whether in Newton’s soap bubble, or in the crystal through the polarizer, will exhibit invariably six or seven rings—a black spot surrounded by six rings, or a circle with a plane cube inside, circumscribed with six distinct rings, the circle itself the *seventh*. The “Norremberg” polarizing apparatus throws into objectivity almost all our occult geometrical symbols,

matter in the solar system exists in seven different conditions. These different states of matter do not all come within the range of our present objective consciousness. But they can be objectively perceived by the spiritual ego in man. . . . Further, *Prajña* or the capacity of perception exists in seven different aspects corresponding to the seven conditions of matter. Strictly speaking, there are but six states of matter, the so-called seventh state being the aspect of Cosmic matter in its original undifferentiated condition. Similarly there are six states of differentiated *Prajña*, the seventh state being a condition of perfect unconsciousness. By differentiated *Prajña*, I mean the condition in which *Prajña* is split up into various states of consciousness. Thus we have six states of consciousness, etc., etc.” (*Five Years of Theosophy*, p. 200). This is precisely our Trans-Himalayan Doctrine.

though physicists are none the wiser for it. (See Newton's and Tyndall's experiments.)¹

The number seven is at the very root of occult Cosmogony and Anthropogony. No symbol to express evolution from its starting to its completion points would be possible without it. For the circle produces the point; the point expands into a triangle, returning after two angles upon itself, and then forms the mystical *Tetraktis*—the plane cube; which *three* when passing into the manifested world of effects, differentiated nature, become geometrically and numerically $3 + 4 = 7$. The best kabbalists have been demonstrating this for ages ever since Pythagoras, and down to the modern mathematicians and symbologists, one of whom has succeeded in wrenching forever *one of the seven* occult keys, and has proven his victory by a volume of figures. Set any of our theosophists interested in the question to read the wonderful work called *Key to the Hebrew-Egyptian Mystery in the Source of Measures*,²† and those of them who are good mathematicians will remain aghast before the revelations contained in it. For it shows indeed that occult source of the measure by which were built kosmos and man, and then by the latter the great Pyramid of Egypt, as all the towers, mounds, obelisks, cave-temples of India, and pyramids in Peru and Mexico, and all the archaic monuments; symbols in stone of Chaldea, both Americas, and even of the Easter Island—the living and solitary witness of a submerged prehistoric continent in the midst of the Pacific Ocean. It shows that the same figures and measures for the same esoteric symbology existed throughout the world; it shows in the words of the author that the kabbala is a “whole series of developments based upon the use of

geometrical elements; giving expression in numerical values, founded on integral values of the circle” (one of the seven keys hitherto known but to the Initiates), discovered by Peter Metius in the 16th century, and re-discovered by the late John A. Parker.³† Moreover, that the system from whence all these developments were derived “was anciently considered to be one resting in *nature* (or God), as the *basis* or *law* of the exertions practically of creative design”; and that it also underlies the Biblical structures, being found in the measurements given for Solomon's temple, the ark of the Covenant, Noah's Ark, etc., etc., — in all the symbolical myths, in short, of the Bible.

And what are the figures, the measure in which the sacred Cubit is derived from the esoteric Quadrature, which the Initiates know to have been contained in the *Tetraktis* of Pythagoras? Why, it is the universal primordial symbol. The figures found in the *Ansated Cross* of Egypt, as (I maintain) in the Indian *Swastika*, “the sacred sign” which embellishes the thousand heads of \square esha, the Serpent-cycle of eternity, on which rests Vishnu, the deity in Infinitude; and which also may be pointed out in the threefold (*treta*) fire of Puraravas, *the first fire in the present Manvantara*, out of the forty-nine (7×7) mystic fires. It may be absent from many of the Hindu books, but the *Vishnu* and other *Puranas* teem with this symbol and figure under every possible form, which I mean to prove in the SECRET DOCTRINE. The author of the *Source of Measures* does not, of course, himself know as yet, the whole scope of what he has discovered. He applies his key, so far, only to the esoteric language and the symbology in the Bible, and the Books of Moses especially. The great error of the able author, in my opinion, is, that he applies the key discovered by him chiefly to post-Atlantean and quasi-historical phallic elements in the world religions; feeling,

¹ One need only open Webster's *Dictionary* and examine the snow flakes and crystals at the word “Snow” to perceive nature's work. “God geometrizes,” says Plato.

² By J. Ralston Skinner. Cincinnati: R. Clarke & Co., 1875; 2nd ed., with Supplement, *ibid.*, 1894; 3rd ed., Philadelphia: David McKay Co., 1931; and a fourth edition done by Wizards Bookshelf, anent 1970.

³ Of Newark, in his work *The Quadrature of the Circle*, his “problem of the three revolving bodies.” (New York: John Wiley and Son, 1851).

intuitively, a nobler, a higher, a more transcendental meaning in all this—*only* in the Bible—and a mere sexual worship in all other religions. This phallic element, however, in the older pagan worship related, in truth, to the physiological evolution of the human races, something that could not be discovered in the Bible, as it is absent from



(the *Pentateuch* being the latest of all the old Scriptures). Nevertheless, what the learned author has discovered and proved mathematically, is wonderful enough, and sufficient to make our claim good: namely, that the figures $\circ\Delta\square$ and $3+4=7$, are at the very basis, and are the soul of cosmogony and the evolution of mankind.

To whosoever desires to display this process by way of symbol, says the author speaking of the *ansated cross*, ♀ the *Tau* of the Egyptians and the Christian cross—

. . . . it would be by the figure of the cube unfolded, in connection with the circle, whose measure is taken off onto the edges of the cube. (The cube unfolded becomes, in superficial display, a cross proper, or of the tau form, and the attachment of the circle to this last gives the ansated cross of the Egyptians, with its obvious meaning of the origin of measures.)¹ Because, also, this kind of measure was made to coordinate with the idea of the origin of human life, it was secondarily made to assume the type of the pudenda hermaphrodite, and, in fact, it is placed by representation to cover this part of the human person in the Hindu form.


It is “the hermaphrodite Indranse Indra, the nature goddess, the *Issa* of the Hebrews, and the *Isis* of the Egyptians,” as the author calls them in another place.

¹ And, by adding to the cross proper + the symbol of the four cardinal points and infinity at the same time, thus , the arms pointing above, below, and right, and left, making six in the circle—the Archaic sign of the Yomas—it would make of it the Swastika, the “sacred sign” used by the order of “Ishmael masons,” which they call the Universal Hermetic Cross, and do not understand its real wisdom, nor know its origin. [H.P.B.]

It is very observable that, while there are but 6 faces to a cube, the representation of the cross as the cube unfolded as to the cross-bars, displays one face of the cube *as common to two bars*, counted as belonging to either; then, while the faces originally represented are but 6, the use of the two bars counts the square as 4 for the upright and 3 for the cross-bar, making 7 in all. Here we have the famous 4, 3 and 7. The four and three are the factor members of the Parker [quadrature and of the “three revolving bodies”] problem. . . . (pp. 50-51).

And they are the factor members in the building of the Universe and MAN. Wittoba — an aspect of Krishna and Vishnu — is therefore the “man crucified in space,” or the “cube unfolded,” as explained (See Edward Moor’s *The Hindoo Pantheon*, for Wittoba).² It is the oldest symbol in India,


² [The facsimile of the picture in E. Moor’s valuable work is reproduced herewith from its first edition (plate 98), published in London in 1810. The “New Edition,” edited by the Rev. W. O. Simpson, and published in 1864, fails to reproduce it, and the



Reverend Editor says in a footnote (p. 283) that “this subject, a crucifix, is omitted in the present edition, for very obvious reasons,” leaving the reader to surmise what such “reasons” may have been. In speaking of the same picture elsewhere, H.P.B. refers the student to page 174 (fig. 72) of Dr. J. P. Lundy’s *Monumental Christianity*, where a facsimile of it can be found. Dr. Lundy says (p. 173): “I do not venture to give it a name, other than that of a *crucifixion in space*. It looks like a Christian crucifix in many respects, and in some others it does not. The drawing, the attitude, and the nail-marks in hands and feet, indicate a Christian origin; while the Parthian coronet of seven points, the absence of the wood and of the usual inscription, and the rays of glory above, would seem to point to some other than a Christian origin. Can it be the Victim-Man, or the Priest and Victim both in one, of the Hindu mythology, who offered himself a sacrifice before the

now nearly lost, as the real meaning of *Viśvakarma* and *Vikartana* (the “sun shorn of his beams”) is also lost. It is the Egyptian *ansated cross*, and *vice versa*, and the latter — even the *sistrum*, with its cross-bars—is simply *the symbol of the Deity as man*—however phallic it may have become later, after the submersion of Atlantis. The *ansated cross* is of course, as Professor Seyffarth has shown — again the *six* with its head — the *seventh*. Seyffarth says:

“It represents, as I now believe, the skull with the brains, the seat of the soul, and with the nerves extending to the spine, back, and eyes or ears. For the Tanis stone translates it repeatedly by *anthropos* (man), and this very word is alphabetically written (Egyptian *ank*. Hence we have the Coptic



ank, vita, properly *anima*, which corresponds with the Hebrew **אנוש**, *anosh*, properly meaning *anima*. This **אנוש** is the primitive **אנוך** for **אנכי** (the personal pronoun I). The

Egyptian *Anki* signifies *my soul*.¹

It means in its synthesis, the *seven principles*, the details coming later. Now the *ansated cross*, as given above, having been discovered on the backs of gigantic statues found on the Easter Island (mid-Pacific Ocean) which is a part of the submerged continent; this remnant being described as

worlds were? Can it be Plato's second God who impressed himself on the universe in the form of the cross? Or is it his divine man who would be scourged, tormented, fettered, have his eyes burnt out; and lastly, having suffered all manner of evils, *would be crucified?* (*Republic*, c. ii, p. 52, Spens' Trans.)."

Edward Moor wrote regarding this subject: "A man, who was in the habit of bringing me Hindu deities, pictures, etc., once brought me two images exactly alike: one of them is engraved in Plate 98, and the subject of it will be at once seen by the most transient glance. Affecting indifference, I inquired of the Pundit what *Deva* it was; he examined it attentively, and after turning it about for some time, returned it to me, professing his ignorance of what *Avatara* it could immediately relate to; but supposed, by the hole in the foot, that it might be Wittoba" Moor himself thought it to be of Christian origin, while Godfrey Higgins (*Anacalypsis*, I, pp. 145-146) considered it to be a genuine Wittoba.—*Compiler*.{BORIS DE ZIRKOFF}

¹ Quoted in *Source of Measures*, p. 53.

“thickly studded with cyclopean statues, remnants of the civilization of a dense and cultivated people”; — and Mr. Subba Row having told us what he had found in the old Hindu books, namely, that the ancient Adepts of India had learned occult powers from the Atlanteans (*vide supra*) — the logical inference is that they had their septenary division from them, just as our Adepts from the “Sacred Island” had. This ought to settle the question.

And this *Tau* cross is ever *septenary*, under whatever form—it has many forms, though the main idea is always one. What are the Egyptian *oozas* (the eyes) the amulets called the “mystic eye,” but symbols of the same? There are the *four* eyes in the upper row and the *three* smaller ones in the lower. Or again, the *ooza* with the *seven luths* hanging from it, “the combined melody of which *creates one man*,” say the hieroglyphics. Or again, the *hexagon* formed of six triangles, whose apices converge to a point, thus:



the *symbol of the Universal creation*, which Kenneth Mackenzie tells us “was worn as a ring by the Sovereign Princes of the Royal Secret” — which they never knew by the bye. *If seven* has nought to do with the mysteries of the universe and man, then indeed from Vedas down to the Bible all the archaic Scriptures — the *Puranas*, the *Avesta* and all the fragments that have reached us — have no *esoteric* meaning, and must be regarded as the Orientalists regard them — as a farago of childish tales.

It is quite true that the *three upadhis* of the *Taraka Raja-Yoga* are, as Mr. Subba Row explains in his little article, “Septenary Division in Different Indian Systems,” “the best and simplest” — but only in purely *contemplative* Yoga. And he adds:

. Though there are seven principles in man, there are but three distinct Upadhis (bases), in each of which his *Atma* may work independently of the rest. These three Upadhis can be separated by an adept without killing himself. He

cannot separate the seven principles from each other without destroying his constitution.¹

Most decidedly he cannot. But this again holds good only with regard to his lower three principles—the body and its (in life) inseparable *prana* and *linga sarira*. The rest can be separated, as they constitute no *vital*, but rather a mental and spiritual necessity. As to the remark in the same article objecting to the fourth principle being “included in the third *ko a* (sheath), as the said principle is but the vehicle of will-power, which is but an energy of the mind,” I answer: Just so. But as the higher attributes of the fifth (*Manas*), go to make up the original *triad*, and it is just the terrestrial energies, feelings and volitions which remain in the *Kama loka*, what is the vehicle, the *astral* form to carry them about as *bhoota* until they fade out—which they take centuries to accomplish? Can the “false” personality, or the *pi acha*, whose ego is made up precisely of all those terrestrial passions and feelings, remain in *Kamaloka*, and occasionally appear, without a substantial vehicle, however ethereal? Or are we to give up the seven principles, and the belief that there is such a thing as an *astral body*, and a *bhoot*, or spook?

Most decidedly not. For Mr. Subba Row himself once more explains how, from the Hindu standpoint, the *lower* fifth, or *Manas*, can reappear after death, remarking very justly, that “it is absurd to call it a *disembodied spirit*.” As he says:

... It is merely a power or force retaining the impressions of the thoughts or ideas of the individual *into whose composition it originally entered* [italics H. P. B.’s]. It sometimes summons to its aid the *Kâmarûpa* power, and creates for itself some particular ethereal form (not necessarily human).²

¹ *Five Years of Theosophy*, p. 186.

² *Five Years of Theosophy*, p. 174.

Now that which “sometimes summons” *Kamarupa*, and the “power” of that name make already two principles, two “powers” — call them as you will. Then we have *Atma* and its vehicle — *Buddhi* — which make *four*. With the three which disappeared on earth this will be equivalent to *seven*. How can we, then, speak of modern Spiritualism, of its materializations and other phenomena, without resorting to the Septenary?

To quote our friend and much respected brother for the last time, since he says that

... our [Aryan] philosophers have associated seven *occult* powers with the seven principles [in men and in the kosmos] or entities above-mentioned. These seven occult powers in the microcosm correspond with, or are the counterparts of, the occult powers in the macrocosm. . . .³

— quite an esoteric sentence—it does seem almost a pity, that words pronounced in an extempore lecture, though such an able one, should have been published without revision.

H. P. BLAVATSKY



REINCARNATION REVISITED

The first objection raised by most people against reincarnation is the fact that we do not remember our past lives. This is indeed, a curious circumstance, and yet not so curious after all when one considers that we remember nothing of our infancy and little of our childhood. Conscious memory is so tenuous a thing, events slip by us with a fluidity so streamlike, that to say “I do not remember” is not

³ *Five Years of Theosophy*, p. 167.

equivalent to proof that something did not occur. If we were to ask any of our friends, "What, exactly, were you doing at 10:26 in the morning of April 5th, 1939?" we could stake our bank balance on the fact that he could not honestly, and precisely, answer the question; yet this lack of recollection of that point of time in his life by no means proves that he did not live through it.

This objection to reincarnation, therefore, is easily met--first on the score that forgetting and repression of memories is a very natural and common human phenomenon and second, on the score that the nature of memory is such that details escape us but principles remain. For example, any educated adult will be able to tell you that 7 times 7 equals 49 and 12 times 12 equals 144. He will not recall all the unhappy hours that he spent in third and fourth grade learning how to perform these operations, but the ability to perform them, and the knowledge of the facts, remain as the useful residuum in his mind of many repeated efforts of attention.

Similarly with man's caution as to fire, his wariness as to dogs, his ability to dance, or his skill in performing anything. The ability to walk argues clearly a period of time when effort was expended in learning how to walk--though not one out of a hundred thousand people would actually remember the specific and exhaustive efforts made in order to acquire that skill.

Forgetfulness of detail, then, does not invalidate memory of principle; and the answer of reincarnationists to those who raise the lack of memory objection is that man's conscience (or level of ethical insight) and his degree of intelligence and capacity represent the carry-over of sum totals from past-life experience, the details of which have escaped him.

The second and more subtle objection raised by the opponents of the reincarnation theory is that it is not ethical

to hold a personality responsible for deeds done by another personality. Consciousness of wrong, they say, surely should be present if an offender's punishment is to have any real meaning. The reincarnationists' answer to this objection is based on what they believe to be the relationship of the personality to the eternal identity.

The eternal identity--like an actor offstage---can remember all its past, but as soon as it takes on a personality, as an actor takes on a role, then it is prevented by a protective provision of nature from remembering anything but the sum totals or the principles which he had learned before. In a sense, it compares with a Shakespearean actor who in his home can recall scenes from any of the dramas in which he has played; while he is acting Hamlet, however, the role of Shylock is completely excluded from his mind.

Similarly the over-soul or eternal identity contains the remembrance of all things that have happened to it in all its personality roles; but these memories are unavailable normally to the little personality (even in immediate afterdeath stages) unless somehow, through some departure from the normal, it taps the memory stream of the identity. Whether this is done through the "unconscious" or the "superconscious" is not of primary importance, though future investigation should be able to define more clearly the realms of mind which these two terms represent. The point is that such a reservoir of memory exists--no matter what it is called or where it is located--and that it can be tapped in a variety of deliberate or accidental ways. This, at least, is the view of reincarnationists.

The objection that it is not ethically sound for an individual to suffer from something he did in his past which he no longer remembers seems, in the last analysis, no more tenable than the complaint that it is unethical for an adult to suffer for unconscious conflicts established in infancy. Dynamic

processes follow laws of their own. We must learn to conform our notion of ethics to nature as it is (and nature is supremely ethical) rather than expect to fit nature to the Procrustean bed of our own preconceived ideas.

The blinders of forgetfulness which conceal the past from us and cause us to see only the small segment which constitutes the present are protective and necessary blinders. At first glance this may seem an odd and improper provision; but perhaps it compares to the system of locks which make it possible for ships to travel from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean through the Panama Canal. The locks may seem, to the untutored mind, an awkward, cumbersome, and thoroughly unnatural device. But the engineers who contrived the system had a difficult engineering problem to solve, namely the conveyance of ships from one level to another, over extensive terrain of differing levels of altitude. The means they used exactly and excellently serve that end.

Similarly in the realm of consciousness. Consciousness, like the water of the Panama Canal, flows in a continuous stream; yet in order to facilitate passage of the vessel of individuality, it is expedient that locks be dropped and water level be altered so as to separate one segment of the passage from another segment. This is the reincarnationist's answer to those who object to reincarnation on the memory issue. (*Many Mansions*, pp. 143-46)

Idiotic Schemes and Shams

If the false prophets of Theosophy are to be left untouched, the true prophets will be very soon — as they have already been — confused with the false. It is nigh time to winnow our corn and cast away the chaff. The T.S. is becoming enormous in its numbers, and if the false prophets, the pretenders or even the weakminded dupes, are left alone, then the Society threatens to

become very soon a fanatical body split into three hundred sects — like Protestantism — each hating the other, and all bent on destroying the truth by **monstrous exaggerations and idiotic schemes and shams**. We do not believe in allowing the presence of *sham* elements in Theosophy because of the fear, forsooth, that if even “a false element in the faith” is ridiculed, the latter “is apt to shake the confidence in the whole.”

H. P. BLAVATSKY

[In 1888 in a letter to Mr. W. Q. Judge this is what Madame Blavatsky wrote: —

Night before last I was shown a bird's eye view of the Theosophical Societies. I saw a few earnest reliable Theosophists in a death struggle with the world in general, with other nominal but ambitious Theosophists. The former are greater in numbers than you may think, and they prevailed, as you in America will prevail, if you only remain staunch to the Master's programme and true to yourselves. And last night I saw . . . and now I feel strong — such as I am in my body — and ready to fight for Theosophy and the few true ones to my last breath. The defending forces have to be judiciously — so scanty they are — distributed over the globe, wherever Theosophy is struggling against the powers of darkness.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

A Definite Philosophy

“I cannot permit our sacred philosophy to be so disfigured. . . If they do not want the whole truth and nothing but the truth, they are welcome. But never will they find us (at any rate) compromising with and pandering to public prejudices.

MASTER K.H.

[Final three items are from ULT London Bulletin #1 of September 21, 1928]