

*Blavatsky on the
Count de Saint-Germain*



Abstract and train of thoughts

Helena Blavatsky on Saint-Germain

| | |
|--|----|
| Count de Saint-Germain was certainly the greatest Oriental Adept Europe has seen in last centuries of the last millennium. | 3 |
| He never laid claim to spiritual powers, but proved to have a right to such claim. | 3 |
| He was a pupil of Indian and Egyptian hierophants, and proficient in the secret wisdom and arts of the East. | 4 |
| Saint-Germain is, until this very time, a living mystery. And the Rosicrucian Thomas Vaughan, another one. | 8 |
| Together with Mesmer, he belonged to the Lodge of the Philalethes. | 8 |
| Like all great men, the Count was slandered and lied about. | 8 |
| Saint-Germain was a “fifth rounder,” a rare case of abnormally precocious individual evolution. | 9 |
| He was sent by Louis XV to England, in 1760, to negotiate peace between the two countries. | 9 |
| Before and during the French Revolution, the Count puzzled and almost terrified every capital of Europe, and some crowned Heads. | 10 |
| Saint-Germain predicted in every detail the social and political upheaval in France that lasted from 1789 until 1799. | 10 |
| In fact, it was he who brought about the just outbreak among the paupers, and put an end to the selfish tyranny of the French kings. | 10 |
| The Count’s temperamental affinity to the celestial science forced the Himalayan Adepts to come into personal relations with him. | 11 |
| When True Magic has finally died out in Europe, Saint-Germain and Cagliostro, sought refuge from the frozen-hearted scepticism in their native land of the East. | 11 |

Biographical and bibliographical notes by Boris de Zirkoff



Helena Blavatsky on Saint-Germain

With critical biographical notes by Boris de Zirkoff, appended on page 12 of this compilation.
Frontispiece by Jean-Joseph Taillasson.

Count de Saint-Germain was certainly the greatest Oriental Adept Europe has seen in last centuries of the last millennium.

The Count de Saint-Germain is referred to as an enigmatical personage by modern writers. Frederic II, King of Prussia, used to say of him that he was a man whom no one had ever been able to make out. Many are his “biographies,” and each is wilder than the other. By some he was regarded as an incarnate god, by others as a clever Alsatian Jew. One thing is certain, Count de Saint-Germain — whatever his real patronymic may have been — had a right to his name and title, for he had bought a property called San Germano, in the Italian Tyrol, and paid the Pope for the title. He was uncommonly handsome, and his enormous erudition and linguistic capacities are undeniable, for he spoke English, Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, German, Russian, Swedish, Danish, and many Slavonian and Oriental languages, with equal facility with a native. He was extremely wealthy, never received a *sou* from anyone — in fact never accepted a glass of water or broke bread with anyone — but made most extravagant presents of superb jewellery to all his friends, even to the royal families of Europe. His proficiency in music was marvellous; he played on every instrument, the violin being his favourite. “Saint-Germain rivalled Paganini himself,” was said of him by an octogenarian Belgian in 1835, after hearing the “Genoese maestro.”

It is Saint-Germain resurrected who plays the violin in the body of an Italian skeleton,

— exclaimed a Lithuanian baron who had heard both.

He never laid claim to spiritual powers, but proved to have a right to such claim.

He used to pass into a dead trance from thirty-seven to forty-nine hours without awakening, and then knew all he had to know, and demonstrated the fact by prophesying futurity and never making a mistake. It is he who prophesied before the Kings Louis XV and XVI, and the unfortunate Marie Antoinette. Many were the still living witnesses in the first quarter of this century who testified to his marvellous memory; he could read a paper in the morning and, though hardly glancing at it, could repeat its contents without missing one word days afterwards; he could write with two hands at once, the right hand writing a piece of poetry, the left a diplomatic paper of the greatest importance. He read sealed letters without touching them, while still in the hand of those who brought them to him. He was the greatest adept in transmuting metals, making gold and the most marvellous diamonds, an art, he said, he had learned from certain Brahmans in India, who taught him the artificial crystallization (“quicken”) of pure carbon. As our Brother Kenneth Mackenzie has it:

In 1780, when on a visit to the French Ambassador to the Hague, he broke to pieces with a hammer a superb diamond of his own manufacture, the counterpart of which, also manufactured by himself, he had just before sold to a jeweller for 5500 Louis d'or.

He was the friend and confidant of Count Orloff in 1772 at Vienna, whom he had helped and saved in St. Petersburg in 1762, when concerned in the famous political conspiracies of that time; he also became intimate with Frederick the Great of Prussia. As a matter of course, he had numerous enemies, and therefore it is not to be wondered at if all the gossip invented about him is now attributed to his own confessions: *e.g.*, that he was over five hundred years old; also, that he claimed personal intimacy “with the Saviour and his twelve Apostles, and that he had reproved Peter for his bad temper” — the latter clashing somewhat in point of time with the former, if he had really claimed to be *only* five hundred years old. If he said that “he had been born in Chaldea and professed to possess the secrets of the Egyptian magicians and sages,” he may have spoken truth without making any miraculous claim. There are Initiates, and not the highest either, who are placed in a condition to remember more than one of their past lives. But we have good reason to know that Saint-Germain could never have claimed “personal intimacy” with the Saviour. However that may be, Count de Saint-Germain was certainly the greatest Oriental Adept Europe has seen during the last centuries. But Europe knew him not. Perchance some may recognize him at the next *Terreur*, which will affect all Europe when it comes, and not one country alone.¹

He was a pupil of Indian and Egyptian hierophants, and proficient in the secret wisdom and arts of the East.

At long intervals have appeared in Europe certain men, whose rare intellectual endowments, brilliant conversation, and mysterious modes of life have astounded and dazzled the public mind. The article now copied from *All the Year Round*² relates to one of these men — the Count de Saint-Germain. In Hargrave Jennings' curious work, *The Rosicrucians*, is described another, a certain Signor Gualdi, who was once the talk of Venetian society. A third was the historical personage known as Alessandro di Cagliostro, whose name has been made the synonym of infamy by a forged Catholic biography. It is not now intended to compare these three individuals with each other or with the common run of men. We copy the article of our London contemporary for quite another object. We wish to show how basely personal character is traduced without the slightest provocation, unless the fact of one's being brighter in mind, and more versed in the secrets of natural law can be construed as a sufficient provocation to set the slanderer's pen and the gossip's tongue in motion. Let the reader attentively note what follows.

Says the writer in *All the Year Round*, meaning the Count de Saint-Germain,

This famous adventurer is supposed to have been an Hungarian by birth, but the early part of his life was by himself carefully wrapped in mystery. His per-

¹ *Theosophical Glossary*: Saint-Germain

² [Vol. XIV, June 5th, 1875, pp. 228-34. New Series. This journal was conducted by Charles Dickens, and published in London by Chapman Hall from 1859 to 1895. — *Boris de Zirkoff*.]

son and his title alike stimulated curiosity. His age was unknown, and his parentage equally obscure. We catch the first glimpse of him in Paris, a century and a quarter ago, filling the court and the town with his renown. Amazed Paris saw a man — apparently of middle age — a man who lived in magnificent style, who went to dinner parties, where he ate nothing, but talked incessantly, and with exceeding brilliancy, on every imaginable topic. His tone was, perhaps, over-trenchant — the tone of a man who knows perfectly what he is talking about. Learned, speaking every civilised language admirably, a great musician, an excellent chemist, he played the part of a prodigy, and played it to perfection. Endowed with extraordinary confidence, or consummate impudence, he not only laid down the law magisterially concerning the present, but spoke without hesitation of events two hundred years old. His anecdotes of remote occurrences were related with extraordinary minuteness. He spoke of scenes at the Court of Francis the First¹ as if he had seen them, describing exactly the appearance of the king, imitating his voice, manner, and language — affecting throughout the character of an eyewitness. In like style he edified his audience with pleasant stories of Louis the Fourteenth, and regaled them with vivid descriptions of places and persons. Hardly saying in so many words that he was actually present when the events happened, he yet contrived, by his great graphic power, to convey that impression. Intending to astonish, he succeeded completely. Wild stories were current concerning him. He was reported to be three hundred years old, and to have prolonged his life by the use of a famous elixir. Paris went mad about him. He was questioned constantly about his secret of longevity, and was marvellously adroit in his replies, denying all power to make old folks young again, but quietly asserting his possession of the secret of *arresting decay in the human frame*. Diet, he protested, was, with his marvellous elixir, the true secret of long life, and he resolutely refused to eat any food but such as had been specially prepared for him — oatmeal, groats, and the white meat of chickens. On great occasions he drank a little wine, sat up as late as anybody would listen to him, but took extraordinary precautions against the cold. To ladies he gave mysterious cosmetics, to preserve their beauty unimpaired; to men he talked openly of his method of transmuting metals, and of a certain process for melting down a dozen little diamonds into one large stone. These astounding assertions were backed by the possession of apparently unbounded wealth, and a collection of jewels of rare size and beauty. . . .

From time to time this strange being appeared in various European capitals, under various names — as Marquis de Montferrat; Count Bellamare, at Venice; Chevalier Schoening, at Pisa; Chevalier Weldon, at Milan; Count Saltikoff, at Genoa; Count Tzarogy, at Schwabach; and, finally, as Count de Saint-Germain, at Paris; but, after his disaster at the Hague, no longer seems so wealthy as before, and has at times the appearance of seeking his fortune.

¹ [The first King of France, 1494–1547, from the Angoulême branch of House of Valois. He reigned from 1515 until his death. Francis was the son of Charles, Count of Angoulême, and Louise of Savoy. He succeeded his cousin and father-in-law Louis XII, who died without a male heir.]

At Tournay he is “interviewed” by the renowned Chevalier de Seingalt, who finds him in an Armenian robe and pointed cap, with a long beard descending to his waist, and ivory wand in hand — the complete make-up of a necromancer. Saint-Germain is surrounded by a legion of bottles, and is occupied in developing the manufacture of hats upon chemical principles. Seingalt being indisposed, the Count offers to physic him gratis, and offers to dose him with an elixir which appears to have been ether; but the other refuses, with many polite speeches. It is the scene of the two augurs. Not being allowed to act as a physician, Saint-Germain determines to show his power as an alchemist; takes a twelve-sous piece from the other augur, puts it on red-hot charcoal, and works with the blowpipe. The piece of money is fused and allowed to cool. “Now,” says Saint-Germain, “take your money again.” — “But it is gold.” — “Of the purest.” Augur number two does not believe in the transmutation, and looks on the whole operation as a trick, but he pockets the piece nevertheless, and finally presents it to the celebrated Marshal Keith, then governor of Neuchâtel.

Again in pursuit of dyeing and other manufacturing schemes, Saint-Germain turned up at St. Petersburg, Dresden, and Milan. Once he got into trouble, and was arrested in a petty town of Piedmont on a protested bill of exchange; but he pulled out a hundred thousand crowns’ worth of jewels, paid on the spot, bullied the governor of the town like a pickpocket, and was released with the most respectful excuses.

Very little doubt exists that during one of his residences in Russia, he played an important part in the revolution which placed Catherine the Second on the throne. In support of this view, Baron Gleichen cites the extraordinary attention bestowed on Saint-Germain at Leghorn in 1770, by Count Alexis Orloff, and a remark made by Prince Gregory Orloff to the Margrave of Anspach during his stay at Nuremberg.

After all, who was he? — the son of a Portuguese king, or of a Portuguese Jew? Or did he, in his old age, tell the truth to his protector and enthusiastic admirer, Prince Charles of Hesse-Cassel? According to the story told his last friend, he was the son of a Prince Rakoczy, of Transylvania, and his first wife a Tékély. He was placed, when an infant, under the protection of the last of the Medici. When he grew up, and heard that his two brothers, sons of the Princess Hesse-Rheinfels, or Rothenburg, had received the names of Saint-Charles and Saint-Elizabeth, he determined to take the name of their holy brother, Sanctus Germanus. What was the truth? One thing alone is certain, that he was a *protégé* of the last Medici. Prince Charles, who appears to have regretted his death, which happened in 1783, very sincerely, tells us that he fell sick, while pursuing his experiments in colours, at Eckernförde, and *died* shortly after, despite the innumerable medicaments prepared by his own private apothecary. Frederick the Great, who, despite his scepticism, took a queer interest in astrologers, said of him, “This is a man who does not die.” Mirabeau adds, epigrammatical-

ly, “He was always a careless fellow, and at last, unlike his predecessors, forgot not to die.”¹

And now we ask what shadow of proof is herein afforded either that Saint-Germain was an “adventurer,” that he meant to “play the part of a prodigy,” or that he sought to make money out of dupes? Not one single sign is there of his being other than what he seemed, *viz.*, a gentleman of magnificent talents and education, and the possessor of ample means to honestly support his standing in society. He claimed to know how to fuse small diamonds into large ones, and to transmute metals, and backed his assertions “by the possession of apparently unbounded wealth, and a collection of jewels of rare size and beauty.” Are “adventurers” like this? Do charlatans enjoy the confidence and admiration of the cleverest statesmen and nobles of Europe for long years and not even at their deaths show in one thing that they were undeserving? Some encyclopaedists say: “He is supposed to *have been employed during the greater part of his life as a spy* at the courts at which he resided!”² But upon what evidence is this *supposition* based? Has anyone found it in any of the state papers in the secret archives of either of these courts? Not one word, not one fraction or shred of fact to build this base calumny upon, has ever been found. It is simply a malicious lie. The treatment that the memory of this great man, this pupil of Indian and Egyptian hierophants, this proficient in the secret wisdom of the East, has had from Western writers is a stigma upon human nature. And so has the stupid world behaved towards every other person who like Saint-Germain, has revisited it after long seclusion devoted to study, with his stores of accumulated esoteric wisdom, in the hope of bettering it and making it wiser and happier.

One other point should be noticed. The above account gives no particulars of the last hours of the mysterious Count or of his funeral. Is it not absurd to suppose that if he really died at the time and place mentioned, he would have been laid in the ground without the pomp and ceremony, the official supervision, the police registration which attend the funerals of men of his rank and notoriety? Where are these data? He passed out of public sight more than a century ago, yet no memoir contains them. A man who so lived in the full blaze of publicity could not have vanished, if *he really died then and there*, and left no trace behind. Moreover, to this negative we have the alleged positive proof that he was living several years after 1784. He is said to have had a most important private conference with the Empress of Russia in 1785 or 1786, and to have appeared to the Princesse de Lamballe when she stood before the tribunal, a few moments before she was struck down with a bullet, and a butcher-boy cut off her head; and to Jeanne du Barry, the mistress of Louis XV, as she waited on her scaffold at Paris the stroke of the guillotine in the Days of Terror, of 1793. A respected member of our Society, residing in Russia, possesses some highly important documents about the Count de Saint-Germain, and for the vindication of the memory of one of the grandest characters of modern times, it is hoped that the

¹ [This article ends with the following words: “What was this man? An eccentric prince, or a successful scoundrel? A devotee of science, a mere schemer, or a strange mixture of all? — a problem, even to himself.” — *Boris de Zirkoff*.]

² See *New American Cyclopaedia*, Vol. XIV, p. 267.

long-needed but missing links in the chain of his chequered history, may speedily be given to the world through these columns.^{1, 2}

Saint-Germain is, until this very time, a living mystery. And the Rosicrucian Thomas Vaughan, another one.

The “Count de Saint-Germain” is, until this very time, a living mystery, and the Rosicrucian Thomas Vaughan another one. The countless authorities we have in literature, as well as in oral tradition (which sometimes is the more trustworthy) about this wonderful Count’s having been met and recognized in different centuries, is no myth. Anyone who admits one of the practical truths of the Occult Sciences taught by the Cabala, tacitly admits them all. It must be Hamlet’s “to be or not to be,” and if the Cabala is true, then Saint-Germain need be no myth.³

Together with Mesmer, he belonged to the Lodge of the Philalethes.

The statement on the authority of Beswick that Cagliostro was connected with the *Loge des Amis Réunis* under the name of Count Grabianca is not proven. There was a Polish Count of that name at the time in France, a mystic mentioned in Madame de Krüdner’s letters which are with the writer’s family, and one who belonged, as Beswick says, together with Mesmer and Count de Saint-Germain, to the Lodge of the Philalethes. Where are Savalette de Langes’ Manuscripts and documents left by him after his death to the Philosophic Scottish Rite? Lost?⁴

The Philalethes, as all Masons know, was a rite founded in Paris in 1773 in the *Loge des Amis Réunis*, based on the principles of Martinism,⁵ and whose members made a special study of the Occult Sciences. The Mother Lodge was a philosophical and *theosophical* Lodge, and therefore Cagliostro was right in desiring to purify its progeny, the Lodge of Philalethes.⁶

Like all great men, the Count was slandered and lied about.

No great man’s reputation was ever yet allowed to rest undisturbed. Voltaire, Paine, and in our own days, Littré, are alleged on their deathbeds to have shown the white feather, turned traitors to their lifelong convictions, and to have died as only cowards can die, recanting those convictions. Saint-Germain is called the “Prince of Impostors,” and “Cagliostro” — a charlatan. But who has ever *proved* that?⁷

¹ [The individual hinted at by H.P. Blavatsky was most likely her aunt, Miss Nadyezhda Andreyevna de Fadeyev. No information is available at this time as to what became of these documents. — *Boris de Zirkoff*.]

² First published in: *The Theosophist*, Vol. II, No. 8, May 1881, pp. 168-70. Republished in *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (COUNT DE SAINT-GERMAIN) III pp. 125-29.

³ *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (A FEW QUESTIONS TO “HIRAF”) I p. 109

⁴ *ibid.*, (WAS CAGLIOSTRO A “CHARLATAN”?) XII p. 84 *fn.* [Full text in the same series.]

⁵ The Martinists were Mystics and Theosophists who claimed to have the secret of communicating with (Elemental and Planetary) Spirits of the ultramundane Spheres. Some of them were practical Occultists.

⁶ *ibid.*, (WAS CAGLIOSTRO A “CHARLATAN”?) XII p. 82

⁷ *ibid.*, (FOOTNOTE TO “PARACELTUS”) IV p. 339

Saint-Germain was a “fifth rounder,” a rare case of abnormally precocious individual evolution.

. . . the gradual development of man’s seven principles and physical senses *has* to be coincident and on parallel lines with Rounds and Root-races. Our *fifth* race has so far developed but its *five* senses. Now, if the *Kama* or *Will*-principle of the “Fourth-rounders” has already reached that stage of its evolution when the automatic acts, the unmotivated instincts and impulses of its childhood and youth, instead of following external stimuli, will have become acts of will framed constantly in conjunction with the mind (*Manas*), thus making of every man on earth of that race *a free agent*, a *fully* responsible being — the *Kama* of our hardly adult *fifth* race is only slowly approaching it. As to the 6th sense of this, our race, it has hardly sprouted above the soil of its materiality. It is highly unreasonable, therefore, to expect for the men of the 5th to sense the nature and essence of that which will be fully *sensed* and perceived but by the 6th — let alone the 7th race — *i.e.*, to enjoy the legitimate outgrowth of the evolution and endowments of the future races with only the help of our present limited senses. The exceptions to this quasi universal rule have been hitherto found only in some rare cases of constitutional, abnormally precocious individual evolutions; or, in such, where by early training and special methods, reaching the stage of the 5th rounders, some men in addition to the natural gift of the latter have fully developed (by certain occult methods) their sixth, and in still rarer cases their seventh, sense. As an instance of the former class may be cited the Seeress of Prévorst; a creature born *out of time*, a rare precocious growth, ill adapted to the uncongenial atmosphere that surrounded her, hence a martyr ever ailing and sickly. As an example of the other, the Count Saint-Germain may be mentioned.¹

He was sent by Louis XV to England, in 1760, to negotiate peace between the two countries.

Certain brethren in England have said from mouth to ear that the destruction was the result of a shameful pact between certain Masons and the Church.² An aged “brother,” a great Kabbalist, has just died here, whose grandfather, a renowned Mason, was an intimate friend of Count de Saint-Germain, when the latter was sent, it is said, by Louis XV, to England, in 1760, to negotiate peace between the two countries. The Count de Saint-Germain left in the hands of this Mason certain documents relating to the history of Masonry, and containing the key to more than one misunderstood mystery. He did so on the condition that these documents would become the secret heritage of all those descendants of the Kabbalists who became Masons. These papers, however, were of value to but two Masons: the father and the son who has just died, and they will be of no use to anyone else in Europe. Before his death, the precious documents were left with an Oriental (a Hindu) who was commissioned to transmit them to a certain person who would come to Amritsar, City of Immortality, to claim them. It is also told, confidentially, that the famous founder of the Lodge

¹ *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (REPLIES TO AN ENGLISH F.T.S.) V pp. 144-45

² [“Our greatest secrets used to be taught in the Masonic lodges the world over. But their Grand Masters and *Gurus* perished one after the other, and what remained written in secret manuscripts — like the one of Nicholas Stone, for instance, destroyed in 1720 by conscientious brethren — was reduced to ashes between the end of the XVIIth and the beginning of the XVIIIth century in England, as well as on the continent.” v.s. p. 183]

of Trinosophists, J.M. Ragon, was also initiated into many secrets by an Oriental, in Belgium, and some say that he knew Saint-Germain in his youth.¹

Before and during the French Revolution, the Count puzzled and almost terrified every capital of Europe, and some crowned Heads.

We may then, strengthen our arguments by giving a few sentences from a curious manuscript belonging to a Fellow of the Theosophical Society in Germany, a learned mystic, who tells us that the document is already on its way to India. It is a sort of diary, written in those mystical characters, half ciphers, half alphabet, adopted by the Rosicrucians during the previous two centuries, and the key to which, is now possessed by only a very few mystics. Its author is the famous and mysterious Count de Saint-Germain; he, who before and during the French Revolution puzzled and almost terrified every capital of Europe, and some crowned Heads; and of whom such a number of weird stories are told. All comment now would be premature.²

Saint-Germain predicted in every detail the social and political upheaval in France that lasted from 1789 until 1799.

For those who are able to understand intuitively what I am about to say, my words will be but the echo of their own thoughts. I draw the attention of such only, to a long series of inexplicable events which have taken place in our present century; to the mysterious influence directing political cataclysms; the doing and undoing of crowned heads; the tumbling down of thrones; the thorough metamorphosis of nearly the whole of the European map, beginning with the French Revolution of '93, predicted in every detail by the Count de Saint-Germain, in an autograph MS., now in possession of the descendants of the Russian nobleman to whom he gave it, and coming down to the Franco-Prussian War of the latter days. This mysterious influence called "chance" by the sceptic and Providence by Christians, may have a right to some other name.³

In fact, it was he who brought about the just outbreak among the paupers, and put an end to the selfish tyranny of the French kings.

Nevertheless, it is our firm conviction based on historical evidence and direct inferences from many of the *Memoirs* of those days that the French Revolution is due to *one* Adept. It is that mysterious personage, now conveniently classed with other "historical *charlatans*" (*i.e.*, great men whose occult knowledge and powers shoot over the heads of the imbecile majority), namely, the Count de Saint-Germain — who brought about the just outbreak among the paupers, and put an end to the selfish tyranny of the French kings — the "elect, and the Lord's anointed."⁴

¹ *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (A DANGER SIGNAL) XI p. 184

² *ibid.*, (NOCTURNAL THOUGHTS) II p. 193

³ *ibid.*, (A FEW QUESTIONS TO "HIRAF") I p. 107 *fn.*

⁴ *ibid.*, (ADEPTS AND POLITICS) VI p. 19

The Count's temperamental affinity to the celestial science forced the Himalayan Adepts to come into personal relations with him.

For centuries the selection of Chelas — outside the hereditary group within the *gon-pa* (temple) — has been made by the Himalayan Mahatmas themselves from among the class — in Tibet, a considerable one as to number — of natural mystics. The only exceptions have been in the cases of Western men like Fludd, Thomas Vaughan, Paracelsus, Pico della Mirandola, Count de Saint-Germain, *etc.*, whose temperamental affinity to this celestial science more or less forced the distant Adepts to come into personal relations with them, and enabled them to get such small (or large) proportion of the whole truth as was possible under their social surroundings.¹

When True Magic has finally died out in Europe, Saint-Germain and Cagliostro, sought refuge from the frozen-hearted scepticism in their native land of the East.

Thus magic exists and has existed ever since prehistoric ages. Begun in history with the Samothracian mysteries, it followed its course uninterruptedly, and ended for a time with the expiring theurgic rites and ceremonies of Christianised Greece; then reappeared for a time again with the Neo-Platonic, Alexandrian school, and passing, by initiation, to sundry solitary students and philosophers, safely crossed the mediæval ages, and notwithstanding the furious persecutions of the Church, resumed its fame in the hands of such adepts as Paracelsus and several others, and finally died out in Europe with the Count de Saint-Germain and Cagliostro, to seek refuge from the frozen-hearted scepticism in its native country of the East.²



¹ *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (CHELAS AND LAY CHELAS) IV p. 607

² *ibid.*, (THE SCIENCE OF MAGIC) I p. 141

Biographical and bibliographical notes by Boris de Zirkoff

From *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (BIBLIOGRAPHY) III pp. 523-28.

No attempt is made here to give even a fragmentary account of the life of this remarkable individual. The best works which deal with the life and activities of Count de Saint-Germain are the one by —

Mrs. Isabel Cooper-Oakley (1854–1914) entitled *The Comte de St. Germain*.

The Secret of Kings (Milano: “Ars Regia,” Casa Editrice del Dott. G. Sulli-Rao, 1912, pp. 284, ill.; 2nd ed., London, Theosophical Publishing House, 1927), parts of which were originally published in *The Theosophical Review* of London (Vols. XXI-XXIII, November 1897 to November 1898), and

The French work by Paul Chacornac entitled *Le Comte de Saint-Germain* (Paris: Chacornac Frères, 11 Quai Saint-Michel, 1947, pp. 318, front.).

Mrs. Cooper-Oakley’s work is very scarce.

Both works are well documented. A special bibliographical section in the first, and copious footnotes in both, contain a wealth of information and references to original documents and sources. Unfortunately, a few errors of judgment have crept into Mrs. Cooper-Oakley’s work wherein she quotes from sources which in later years have become suspect. In Chacornac’s work, on the other hand, too much space is devoted to various imaginative accounts current in Theosophical and pseudo-theosophical groups about de Saint-Germain. This adds nothing of value to an otherwise serious and scholarly work.

We feel that a careful perusal of these two works would be of greater advantage to the student than reading many other less accurate books written by people who had no interest in occult studies.

Among the pitfalls to be cautiously avoided, mention should be made of the following:

① Count de Saint-Germain, the occultist, has been frequently confused with Claude-Louis de Saint-Germain (1707–1778), a Frenchman famous for his military talents and at one time, namely in 1775, appointed by Louis XVIth a Secretary of War, at the death of the Maréchal de Mury. References to the Margrave of Anspach, the localities of Schwabach and Triesdorf, as well as to Count Alexis Orlov (1735–1807), Catherine II of Russia, and the Russian Court Revolution of the time, are all connected with Claude-Louis and have nothing to do with Count de Saint-Germain, the renowned occultist. Mrs. Cooper-Oakley and others were not careful enough on this subject.¹

¹ See *Mémoires de M. le Comte de Saint-Germain, écrits par lui-même*. Amsterdam: Ray, 1779. German translation, Frankfurt 1780.

② The Princely Family of Rákóczy is well known for the active part it took in the national life of Transylvania. Overlooking for the present the earlier periods in the history of this family, suffice it to say that Francis (Ferenc) Rákóczy I (1645–1676) married March 1st, 1666, Helen (Ilona) Zrinyi, daughter of Péter Zrinyi and the Countess Catherine (Katalin) Frangepán. Péter, having conspired against Austria, was executed at Wiener-Neustadt, together with Count Frangepán. Francis Rákóczy I, with his wife and his mother, Sophia (Zsófia) Báthory, took refuge in the fortress of Munkács. His life was saved by the interposition of the Jesuits on the payment of an enormous ransom. Three children issued from this marriage: George (György), born in 1667 and who lived but a few months; Juliánna, born in 1672 and who died in 1717; and Francis (Ferenc) Rákóczy II, born March 27th, 1676, and who died April 8th, 1735. Their father died on July 8th, 1676, but a few months after the birth of Francis.

The widowed Helen Zrinyi married June 15th, 1682, Count Imréhez Thököly. The latter, an ally of Turkey against Austria, was arrested and sent to Belgrade; his wife was taken to Vienna and was free within the confines of this city. Emperor Charles VI took charge of the two remaining children of Francis Rákóczy. One year later, Helen Zrinyi rejoined Imréhez Thököly and never saw again either her fatherland or her children.

At the age of 18, Francis Rákóczy II married, September 25th, 1694, Charlotte-Amalia von Hessen-Rheinfels; from this marriage issued: Leopold-George (Lipót-György), born at Kistapolcsány May 28th, 1696, and who died in 1700; Joseph (József), born August 17th, 1700, and who died November 10th, 1738; George (György), born August 8th, 1701, and who died June 22nd, 1756; and Charlotta, born November 16th, 1706.

Some have claimed that it is the elder son of Francis Rákóczy II, Leopold-George, who became our Count de Saint-Germain, but there are authentic records to the effect that this boy died when he was only four years old. In the light of the above-mentioned historical facts, various statements by Carl, Landgrave of Hessen, and others, appear to be contradictory and unreliable.

In a letter written by Count von Alvensleben to Emperor Frederick II, whose ambassador he was at Dresden, and dated June 25th, 1777, the writer says that Count de Saint-Germain told him that he was known as *Prince Rákóczy*. However, he did not say he was the son of Francis Rákóczy II, and did not name his two brothers. Instances when Count de Saint-Germain used the name of Rákóczy are not definitely authenticated.

In the light of what precedes, it is highly inadvisable and historically unjustifiable to speak of the occultist de Saint-Germain as being “the Master, Prince Rákóczy,” as has been repeatedly done by various students of Theosophy and groups of students within and outside of the organized Theosophical Movement, even to the extent of listing his former incarnations. Any connection with the House of Rákóczy on the part of Count de Saint-Germain cannot be established by any accessible historical data or available documentary evidence, even though this idea may appeal to the imagination of certain students and serve as a suitable background for their speculations.

We do not deny the possibility of such a connection, which may or may not have existed, subject to future disclosures. We simply warn the careful student not to accept on mere hearsay, alleged facts which, in reality, cannot be at present either proved or disproved by any tangible evidence.

③ Another point of very great importance is the fact that a number of writers, including Mrs. Cooper-Oakley and Philip Malpas (1875–1958),¹ have accepted as genuine the so-called *Souvenirs sur Marie-Antoinette* by the Countess d’Adhémar.² It is true that the Countess d’Adhémar was on intimate terms with Marie-Antoinette. She was originally Mademoiselle de Pont-Chavigny, later the widow of the Marquis de Valbelle; she married Comte d’Adhémar around 1782. The Count had been known under the name of Montfalcon and was in military service. He was a descendant of the d’Adhémar family which had been extinct since the 16th century. The Countess was born in 1760 and died in 1822. As the Count de Saint-Germain was in Paris in the years 1758 and 1759, she could not have known him in those days. Curiously enough, the *Souvenirs* of the Countess d’Adhémar range over the period from 1760 to 1821.

These *Souvenirs*, however, were written by the Baron Étienne-Léon de La Mothe-Langon (1786–1864), a prolific writer of “historical” memoirs in which truth and fiction are cleverly interwoven to keep the reader spellbound. For anyone to accept his writings as a sober narrative of actual events, or as quoting *verbatim* what was told him by participants in such events, is highly unwise. A closer analysis of this would lead us too far afield. The *Souvenirs* of the Countess d’Adhémar should be taken with several “grains of salt,” and not flaunted as some historical document of unquestioned authenticity.

From H.P. Blavatsky’s own words, it appears that her aunt, Nadyezhda Andreyevna de Fadeyev, had in her possession some important documents concerning the Count de Saint-Germain. In her work about the Count, Isabel Cooper-Oakley definitely states that she has been permitted to obtain some excerpts from the famous *Souvenirs*, a copy of which was at the time in the library of Madame de Fadeyev. It is probable that Blavatsky’s reference was to that work in the library of her aunt.

While no published work about Count de Saint-Germain, or any that mentions him or recounts certain events connected with him, can receive a blanket endorsement, there are at least some which may be looked upon as relatively reliable, and which are most certainly no forgeries or out and out romances. Among them mention should be made of the following:

Mémoires de mon temps. This work, according to the title-page, was dictated by the Landgrave Prince Carl von Hessen-Kassel, and published in Copenhagen in 1861. The Prince was born at Kassel December 19th, 1744, the son of Prince Frederick of Hessen and of Mary, daughter of King George II of England. After spending part of his life at the Court of Christian VII, King of Denmark, whose

¹ P. Malpas’ essay on Count de Saint-Germain appeared in *The Theosophical Path* (Point Loma, California), Vols. VI, VII, VIII and IX, from January 1914, through July 1915, though the Series was not completed.

² The full title being: *Souvenirs sur Marie-Antoinette, archiduchesse d’Autriche, reine de France, et sur la Cour de Versailles*, par Mme. la Comtesse d’Adhémar, dame du palais. Paris: Marne, 1836; 4 tomes in 2 vols., 12°.

daughter he married, he lived for many years on intimate terms with Frederick II of Prussia. The work (published by J.H. Schultz, 8vo., I-151 pp.) is extremely rare and may be consulted in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris.

Denkwürdigkeiten des Barons Carl-Heinrich von Gleichen,¹ etc., Leipzig: Druck von J.B. Hirschfeld, 1847. 8vo., 234 pp. This work exists in French under the title of: *Souvenirs de Charles Henri, Baron de Gleichen*. Paris: Téchener, 1868. 12°, xlviii, 227 pp. It includes a Prefatory Note by Paul Grimblot.

Mémoires de Mme. Du Hausset, femme de chambre de Mme. de Pompadour.² Paris: Baudoin frères, 1824. 8vo., xl, 313 pp. The work includes Notes and historical explanations by Quentin Craufurd, and an Essay on the Marquise de Pompadour by J.B.D. Després. Another edition (Paris: Firmin-Didot frères, 1846, 525 pp.) includes excerpts from the historical and literary *Mémoires* of Bauchaumont, from 1762 to 1782, and a Prefatory Note and comments by Fs. Barrière. Still another ed. (Paris: E. Flammarion, 1891, xx, 181 pp.) was published with a Preface and Notes by Hippolyte Fournier.

Among the more recent works on the Count, mention should be made of the work by Pierre Lhermier, *Le mystérieux comte de Saint-Germain*, posthumously published at Paris in 1943 by the Éditions Colbert. This is one of the most carefully written works evidencing an understanding of the subject.

As to the portrait of Count de Saint-Germain, there is only one known to have existed. It was in the collection of Jeanne Camus de Pontcarré, Marquise d'Urfé, who died November 13th, 1775. According to Paul Chacornac's opinion, this portrait was painted by Count Pietro dei Rotari (1707–1762), an artist who was born at Verona, Italy, and acquired a considerable reputation in his native land. He was a disciple of Antoine Balestra and of Ange Trevisani, and produced several rather large paintings, some of which are in Munich and Dresden.³ Later in life, Rotari went to Russia at the invitation of Empress Elizabeth, and became her Court Painter. He died in St. Petersburg, after some years of very successful work during which he painted several hundred portraits, some of which were at one time in the Palace at Peterhof. Rotari was on intimate terms with Count de Saint-Germain who travelled to St. Petersburg at his suggestion, where they frequented together many of the renowned aristocratic families of Russia.

It is Chacornac's opinion that Count de Saint-Germain presented to Madame d'Urfé this portrait painted by Rotari, somewhat prior to his departure for The Hague, at the beginning of 1760. When she died, a portion of her collection was bought by the Duke de la Vallière in 1777, at whose death both his library and his paintings were sold.

¹ Baron von Gleichen was born at Nemersdorf, near Bayreuth, in 1735, and died at Ratisbonne, April 5th, 1807. After being in the service of the Margrave of Bayreuth and of Denmark, he devoted himself to study and writing. His work is also extremely scarce, but may be consulted both in the British Museum and the National Library at Paris.

² The author of these *Mémoires* was Nicolle, daughter of François Colleson, leather currier, and of Claudine Rollot, daughter of a draper-merchant at Vitry-le-François, and was born in that town July 14th, 1713. She married Jacques-René du Hausset, an equerry, who died in 1743. She became housemaid to Mme. de Pompadour, and died July 24th, 1801, after a life of many vicissitudes.

³ Cf. Siret, *Dictionnaire historique des peintres*, Paris, Lacroix, 1866.

BLAVATSKY ON SAINT-GERMAIN
BIOGRAPHY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY BY DE ZIRKOFF

It was most likely at this time that a French engraver known as N. Thomas (b. about 1750; d. in Paris about 1812) produced a copper engraving of the oil painting, and this engraving eventually was deposited in the “Cabinet des Estampes” of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris.



The Royal Château de Chambord at Loir-et-Cher, France, where King Louis XV granted to the Count de Saint-Germain lodgings, May and December 1758.

