

Subba Row on the Sevenfold Principle in Man



Ancient Greek tetrastyle portico under a triangular roof¹
Temple of Saptaparna,² the Heavenly Man, and His glorious destiny.

¹ This elegant model of four Ionic columns was created by Jason.

² Named after “a famous cave, a Vihāra, in Rājagriha, now near Buddhagaya, where the Lord Buddha used to meditate and teach his Arhats, and where after his death the first Synod was held. This cave had seven chambers, whence the name. In Esotericism Saptaparna is the symbol of the ‘sevenfold Man-Plant.’” (*Theosophical Glossary*)

Another symbol of the Septenary Man is a triad over tetrad, $\hat{\Delta}$, a double glyph of Γ , Gaia-Earth, expressed geometrically. (*Cf. Secret Doctrine*, II p. 591) The 3 and the 4, the triangle and the cube, or the male-female universal glyph, are the first aspect of the evolving deity. (*Cf. ibid.*, I p. 321) The double glyph of Γ has been disguised in the Greek Tau. *Cf.* “Crucified between two thieves” in our Buddhas and Initiates Series, and “Keys to the Mystery Language,” in our Theosophy and Theosophists Series, the latter being a gallery of esoteric symbols.

The Aryan-Arhat Esoteric Tenets

By T. Subba Row, B.A., B.L.¹

First published in: *The Theosophist*, Vol. III, No. 4, January 1882, pp. 93-99.
Republished in: *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, III pp. 400-18

[It has been thought advisable to publish here the entire text of this material by T. Subba Row, because H.P. Blavatsky's numerous footnotes and Appendices might not be easily understood without the main text to which they are appended.]

. . . Probably the Āryan (we shall for the present call it by that name) and the Chaldeo-Tibetan esoteric doctrines are fundamentally identical and the secret doctrine of the Jewish Kabbalists merely an offshoot of these. Nothing, perhaps, can be more interesting now to a student of occult philosophy than a comparison between the two principal doctrines above mentioned. Your letter seems to indicate two divisions in the Chaldeo-Tibetan doctrine:

- (1) that of the so-called Lamaists; and
- (2) that of the so-called Arhats (in Buddhism, Arahats, or Rahats) which has been adopted by the Himalayan or Tibetan Brotherhood.

What is the distinction between these two systems? Some of our ancient Brāhmanical writers have left us accounts of the main doctrines of Buddhism and the religion and philosophy of the Arhats — the two branches of the Tibetan esoteric doctrine being so called by them. As these accounts generally appear in treatises of a polemical character, I cannot place much reliance upon them.

It is now very difficult to say what was the real ancient Āryan doctrine. If an enquirer were to attempt to answer it by an analysis and comparison of all the various systems of esotericism prevailing in India, he will soon be lost in a maze of obscurity and uncertainty. No comparison between our real Brāhmanical and the Tibetan esoteric doctrines will be possible unless one ascertains the teachings of that so-called "Āryan doctrine," . . . and fully comprehends the *whole range* of the ancient Āryan philosophy. Kapila's "Sāṅkhya," Patañjali's "Yoga philosophy," the different systems of "Śāktya" philosophy, the various *Agamas* and *Tantras* are but branches of it. There is a doctrine though, which is their real foundation and which is sufficient to explain the secrets of these various systems of philosophy and harmonize their teachings. It probably existed long before the *Vedas* were compiled, and it was studied by our ancient Rishis in connotation with the Hindu scriptures. It is attributed to one mysterious personage called Mahā.² . . .

The *Upanishads* and such portions of the *Vedas* as are not chiefly devoted to the public ceremonials of the ancient Āryans are hardly intelligible without some knowledge of *that doctrine*. Even the real significance of the grand ceremonials referred to in the *Vedas* will not be perfectly apprehended without its light being

¹ We give but extracts from the long letter of the above-named gentleman. ["We" stands for H.P. Blavatsky as Editor of *The Theosophist*. — Boris de Zirkoff.]

² The very title of the present chief of the Esoteric Himalayan Brotherhood.

thrown upon them. . . . The *Vedas* were perhaps compiled mainly for the use of the priests assisting at public ceremonies, but the grandest conclusions of our real secret doctrine are therein mentioned. I am informed by persons competent to judge of the matter, that the *Vedas* have a distinct dual meaning — one expressed by the literal sense of the words, the other *indicated by the metre and the Svāra* which are, as it were, the life of the *Vedas*. . . . Learned Pundits and philologists, of course, deny that Svāra has anything to do with philosophy or ancient esoteric doctrines. But the mysterious connection between *Svāra and light* is one of its most profound secrets.

Now it is extremely difficult to show whether the Tibetans derived their doctrine from the ancient Rishis of India, or the ancient Brahmans learned their occult science from the adepts of Tibet; or again whether the adepts of both countries professed originally the same doctrine and derived it from a common source.¹ If you were to go to the Śramana Balagula² and question some of the Jaina Pundits there about the authorship of the *Vedas* and the origin of the Brāhmanical esoteric doctrine, they would probably tell you that the *Vedas* were composed by *Rākshasas*³ or *Daityas*, and that the Brahmans had derived their secret knowledge from them.⁴ Do these assertions mean that the *Vedas* and the Brāhmanical esoteric teachings had their origin in the lost Atlantis — the continent that once occupied a considerable portion of the expanse of the Southern and the Pacific oceans? Your assertion in *Isis Unveiled* that Sanskrit was the language of the inhabitants of the said continent, may induce one to suppose that the *Vedas* had probably their origin there — wherever else might be the birthplace of the Āryan esotericism.⁵ But the real esoteric doctrine as well as the mystic allegorical philosophy of the *Vedas* were derived from another source, again, whatever that source may be — perchance, from the divine inhabitants-gods of the sacred Island which, as you say, once existed in the sea that covered in days of old the sandy tract now called Gobi Desert. However that may be, 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.⁶ The Tibetan adepts, however, have not accepted this addition to their esoteric doctrine. And, it is in this respect that one should expect to find a difference between the two doctrines.⁷

¹ See *Appendix*, Note I.

² [Also known as Shraavanabelagola, “the white pond of the Sravana” or “the Jain monk,” named after the colossal Jain image of the place and the prefix Shravana that also serves to distinguish it from other Belgolas with the prefixes Hale and Kodi.]

³ A kind of demon — *Devil*.

⁴ And so would the Christian padris. But they would never admit that their “fallen angels” were borrowed from the *Rakshasas*; that their “Devil” is the illegitimate son of *Dewel* — the Singhalese female demon, or that the “War in Heaven” of the *Apocalypse* — the foundation of the Christian dogma of the “Fallen Angels” — was copied from the Hindu story about Śiva hurling the *Tārakasurs* who rebelled against Brahma into *Andhakāra* — the abode of Darkness, according to Brāhmanical *Shastras*.

⁵ Not necessarily. — See *Appendix*, Note II. From rare MSS. just received, we will shortly prove Sanskrit to have been spoken in Java and adjacent islands from remote antiquity.

⁶ A locality which is spoken of to this day by the Tibetans and called by them “Śambhala,” the *Happy Land*. — See *Appendix*, Note III. [The statement referred to in *Isis Unveiled* is in Vol. I, p. 594 *fn.*, and is according to L. Jacolliot and not H.P. Blavatsky’s own. — *Boris de Zirkoff*.]

⁷ To comprehend this passage fully, the reader must turn to Vol. I, pp. 589-94, of *Isis Unveiled*.

The Brāhmanical occult doctrine probably contains everything that was taught about *the powers of nature* and their laws, either in the mysterious Island of the North, or in the equally mysterious continent of the South. And, if you mean to compare the Āryan and the Tibetan doctrines as regards their teachings about the occult powers of nature, you must beforehand examine all the classifications of these powers, their laws and manifestations and the real connotations of the various names assigned to them in the Āryan doctrine. Here are some of the classifications contained in the Brāhmanical system:

Classification of the occult powers

- I as appertaining to *Parabrahman* and existing in the MACROCOSM.
- II as appertaining to man and existing in the MICROCOSM.
- III for the purposes of *Tāraka Yoga* or *Pranava Yoga*.
- IV for the purposes of *Sāṅkhya Yoga* (where they are, as it were, the inherent attributes of *Prakriti*).
- V for the purposes of *Hatha Yoga*.
- VI for the purposes of *Kula Agama*.
- VII for the purposes of *Śakta Agama*.
- VIII for the purposes of *Śiva Agama*.
- IX for the purposes of *Śrīchakra*. (The *Śrīchakra* you referred to in *Isis Unveiled* is not *the real esoteric Śrīchakra* of the ancient adepts of Āryāvarta)¹
- X in *Atharvana Veda*, etc.

In all these classifications, subdivisions have been multiplied indefinitely by conceiving new combinations of the Primary Powers in different proportions. But I must now drop this subject and proceed to consider the article headed “Fragments of Occult Truth,” in the October number of *The Theosophist*.

I have carefully examined it, and find that the results arrived at (in the Buddhist doctrine) do not seem to differ much from the conclusions of our Āryan philosophy, though our mode of stating the arguments may differ in form. I shall now discuss the question from my own standpoint, though following for facility of comparison and convenience of discussion the sequence of classification of the *sevenfold* entities or Principles constituting man which is adopted in your article. The questions raised for discussion are

- (1) whether the *disembodied spirits* of human beings (as they are called by Spiritualists) appear in the *séance* rooms and elsewhere; and
- (2) whether the manifestations taking place are produced wholly or partly through their agency.

¹ Very true. But who would be allowed to give out the “real esoteric one”? [See *Isis Unveiled*, II p. 265.]

It is hardly possible to answer these two questions satisfactorily unless the meaning intended to be conveyed by the expression “*disembodied spirits of human beings*” be accurately defined. The words *Spiritualism* and *Spirit* are very misleading. Unless English writers in general, and Spiritualists in particular, first ascertain clearly the *connotation* they mean to assign to the word *spirit*, there will be no end of confusion, and the real nature of these so-called spiritualistic phenomena and their *modus occurrendi* can never be clearly defined. Christian writers generally speak of only two entities in man — the body, and the *soul* or *spirit* (both seeming to mean the same thing to them). European philosophers generally speak of *Body* and *Mind*, and argue that soul or spirit cannot be anything else than mind. They are of opinion that any belief in *Linga-śarīra*¹ is entirely unphilosophical. These views are certainly incorrect, and are based on unwarranted assumptions as to the possibilities of nature, and on an imperfect understanding of its laws. I shall now examine (from the standpoint of the Brāhmanical esoteric doctrine) the Spiritual constitution of man, the various entities or principles existing in him, and ascertain whether either of those entities entering into his composition can appear on earth after his death; and, if so, *what is it that so appears*.

You have read some of Professor Tyndall’s excellent papers on what he calls “Germ Theory,” giving the facts ascertained by his experiments. His conclusions may be briefly stated thus: — Even in a very small volume of space there are myriads of protoplasmic germs floating in ether. If, for instance, say — water (clear water) is exposed to them and if they fall into it, some form of life or other will be evolved out of them. Now, what are the agencies for bringing of this life into existence? Evidently:

- I. *The water*, which is the field, so to say, for the growth of life.
- II. The protoplasmic germ, out of which life or a living organism is to be evolved or developed. And, lastly,
- III. The power, energy, force or tendency which springs into activity at the touch or combination of the protoplasmic germ and the water, and which evolves or develops life and its natural attributes.

Similarly, there are three primary causes which bring the human being into existence. I shall call them for the purpose of discussion by the following names:

- (1) *Parabrahman* — The Universal Spirit.
- (2) *Śakti* (the crown of the astral light combining in itself all the powers of nature).
- (3) *Prakriti*, which in its original or primary shape is represented by *Ākāśa* (really, every form of matter is finally reducible to *Ākāśa*.)²

It is ordinarily stated that *Prakriti* or *Ākāśa* is the *Kshetra* or the basis which corresponds to water in the example we have taken; *Brahman* the *germ*, and *Śakti* the power or energy that comes into existence at their union or contact.¹

¹ The Astral Body — so called.

² The Tibetan esoteric Buddhist doctrine teaches that *Prakriti* is cosmic matter, out of which all visible forms are produced; and *Ākāśa* that same cosmic matter — but still more imponderable, its spirit, as it were, “*Prakriti*” being the body or *substance*, and *Ākāśa-Śakti* its soul or energy.

But this is not the view which the *Upanishads* take of the question. According to them, Brahman² is the *Kshetra* or basis, *Ākāśa* or *Prakriti*, the germ or seed, and *Śakti* the power evolved by their union or contact. And this is the real scientific, philosophical mode of stating the case.

Now, according to the adepts of ancient Āryāvarta, *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 cause amounts to $2^3 - 1 = 8 - 1 = 7$.

As a general rule, whenever seven *entities* are mentioned in the ancient occult science 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. To take a familiar example, the *seven* coloured rays in the solar ray are evolved out of *three primary coloured* rays; and the three primary colours co-exist with the four secondary colours in the solar rays. Similarly, the three primary entities which brought man into existence co-exist in him with the *four secondary* entities which arose from different combinations of the three primary entities

Now these seven *entities* which in their totality constitute man, are as follows:

I shall enumerate them in the order adopted in your article, as far as the two orders (the Brāhmanical and the Tibetan):

¹ Or, in other words, "*Prakriti*, *Svabhāva* or *Ākāśa* is — SPACE as the Tibetans have it; Space filled with whatsoever substance or no substance at all; *i.e.*, with substance so imponderable as to be only metaphysically conceivable. *Brahmā*, then, would be the germ thrown into the soil of that field, and *Śakti*, that mysterious energy or force which develops it, and which is called by the Buddhist Arahats of Tibet — FO-HAT.

"That which we call form (*rūpa*) is not different from that which we call space (*Śūnyatā*) . . . Space is not different from Form. Form is the same as Space; Space is the same as Form. And so with the other skandhas, whether *vedanā*, or *sañjñā*, or *samskāra* or *viñjana*, they are each the same as their opposite." . . . (Book of *Sin-king* or the "Heart Sutra." Chinese translation of the *Mahā-Prajñā-Pāramitā-Hridaya-Sūtra*, Chapter on the *Avalokiteśvara*, or the *manifested Buddha*.)

So that, the Āryan and Tibetan or Arhat doctrines agree perfectly in substance, differing but in names given and the way of putting it, a distinction resulting from the fact that the Vedāntin Brahmans believe in Parabrahman, a *deific* power, impersonal though it may be, while the Buddhists entirely reject it.

[See "Chaos to sense, latent deity to reason" in our Secret Doctrine's First Proposition Series. — ED. PHIL.]

² See *Appendix*, Note IV.

	Corresponding names in your classification
I <i>Prakriti</i> .	<i>Sthūlaśarīra</i> (Physical Body).
II The entity evolved out of the combination of <i>Prakriti</i> and <i>Śakti</i> .	<i>Sūkśmaśarīra</i> or <i>Linga-śarīra</i> (Astral Body).
III <i>Śakti</i> .	<i>Kāmarūpa</i> (the <i>Périsprit</i>).
IV The entity evolved out of the combination of <i>Brahman</i> , <i>Śakti</i> and <i>Prakriti</i> .	<i>Jivātma</i> (Life-Soul).
V The entity evolved out of the combination of <i>Brahman</i> and <i>Prakriti</i> .	Physical Intelligence (or animal soul).
VI The entity evolved out of the combination of <i>Brahman</i> and <i>Śakti</i> .	Spiritual Intelligence (or Soul).
VII <i>Brahman</i> .	The emanation from the ABSOLUTE, <i>etc.</i> (or pure spirit).

Before proceeding to examine the nature of these seven entities, a few general explanations are indispensably necessary.

I. The secondary principles arising out of the combination of primary principles are quite different in their nature from the entities out of whose combination they came into existence. The combinations in question are not of the nature of mere mechanical juxtapositions, as it were. They do not even correspond to chemical combinations. Consequently no valid inferences as regards the nature of the combinations in question, can be drawn by analogy from the nature [variety?] of these combinations.

II. The general proposition that when once a cause is removed its effect vanishes, is not universally applicable. Take, for instance, the following example: — if you once communicate a certain amount of momentum to a ball, velocity of a particular degree in a particular direction is the result. Now, the cause of this motion ceases to exist when the instantaneous sudden impact or blow which conveyed the momentum is completed; but, according to the *first Law of Motion*, the ball will continue to move on for ever and ever with undiminished velocity in the same direction unless the said motion is altered, diminished, neutralized or counteracted by extraneous causes. Thus, if the ball stop, it will not be on account of the absence of the cause of its motion, but in consequence of the existence of extraneous causes which produce the said result.

Again, take the instance of *subjective phenomena*.

Now the presence of this inkbottle before me is producing in me or in my mind a mental representation of its form, colour and so forth. The bottle in question may be removed, but still its mental picture may continue to exist. Here, again, you see, the effect survives the cause. Moreover, the effect may at any subsequent time be called into conscious existence, whether the original cause be present or not.

Now, in case of the fifth principle above mentioned — the entity that came into existence by the combination of Brahman and Prakriti, — if the general proposition (in the “Fragments of Occult Truth”) is correct, this principle which corresponds to the *physical intelligence* must cease to exist whenever the *Brahman* or the seventh principle should cease to exist for the particular individual; but the fact is certainly otherwise. You stated the general proposition under consideration in support of your assertion that whenever the seventh principle ceases to exist for any particular individual, the sixth principle also ceases to exist for him. The assertion is undoubtedly true though the mode of stating it and the reasons assigned for it are to my mind objectionable.

You said that in cases where tendencies of a man’s mind are entirely material, and all spiritual aspirations and thoughts were altogether absent from his mind, the seventh principle leaves him either before or at the time of death, and the sixth principle disappears with it. Here, the very proposition that the tendencies of the particular individual’s mind are *entirely* material, involves the assertion that there is no spiritual intelligence or spiritual *Ego* in him. You should then have said that, whenever spiritual intelligence should cease to exist in any particular individual, the seventh principle ceases to exist for that particular individual for all purposes. Of course, it does not fly off anywhere. There can never be anything like a change of position in the case of Brahman.¹ The assertion merely means that there is no recognition whatever of *Brahman*, or spirit, or life, or spiritual consciousness, the seventh principle has ceased to exercise any influence or control over the individual’s destinies.

I shall now state what is meant (in the Āryan doctrine) by the seven principles above enumerated.

I Prakriti This is the basis of *Sthūlaśarīra* and represents it in the above-mentioned classification.

II Prakriti and Śakti This is the *Lingaśarīra*, or astral body.

III Śakti This principle corresponds to your *Kāmarūpa*. This power or force is placed by ancient occultists in the *Nābhichakra*. This power can gather *Ākāśa* or *prakriti* and mould it into any desired shape. It has very great sympathy with the fifth principle, and can be made to act by its influence or control.

IV Brahman, Śakti and Prakriti This again corresponds to your second principle, *Jīvātma*. This power represents the universal life-principle which exists in na-

¹ True — from the standpoint of Āryan *Esotericism*, and the *Upanishads*; not quite so in the case of the *Arahat* or Tibetan esoteric doctrine; and it is only on this one solitary point that the two teachings disagree, as far as we know. The difference is very trifling though, resting, as it does, solely upon the two various methods of viewing the one and the same thing from two different aspects. — See *Appendix* Note IV.

ture. Its seat is the *Anāhatachakra* (heart). It is a force or power which constitutes what is called *Jīva*, or life. It is, as you say, indestructible, and its activity is merely transferred at the time of death to another set of atoms, to form another organism. But it is not called *Jīvātma* in our philosophy. The term *Jīvātma* is generally applied by our philosophers to the seventh principle when it is distinguished from *Paramātma* or *Parabrahman*.¹

V Brahman and Prakriti This, in our Āryan philosophy, corresponds to your fifth principle, called the *physical intelligence*. According to our philosophers, this is the entity in which what is called *Mind* has its seat or basis. This is the most difficult principle of all to explain, and the present discussion entirely turns upon the view we take of it.

Now, what is mind? It is a mysterious something which is considered to be the seat of consciousness — of sensations, emotions, volitions and thoughts. Psychological analysis shows it to be apparently a congeries of mental states, and possibilities of mental states, connected by what is called memory, and considered to have a distinct existence apart from any of its particular mental states or ideas. Now in what entity has this mysterious something its potential or actual existence? *Memory* and *expectation* which form, as it were, the real foundation of what is called *individuality*, or *Ahamkāra*, must have their seat of existence somewhere. Modern psychologists of Europe generally say that the material substance of *Brain* is the seat of mind; and that past *subjective experiences*, which can be recalled by memory, and which in their totality constitute what is called *individuality*, exist therein in the shape of certain unintelligible mysterious impressions and changes in the nerves and nerve centres of the cerebral hemispheres. Consequently, they say, the mind — the individual mind — is destroyed when the body is destroyed; so there is no possible existence after death.

But there are a few facts among those admitted by these philosophers which are sufficient for us to demolish their theory. In every portion of the human body, a constant change goes on without intermission. Every tissue, every muscular fibre and nerve tube, and every ganglionic centre in the brain is undergoing an incessant change. In the course of a man's lifetime there may be a series of *complete transformations* of the substance of his *Brain*. Nevertheless the memory of his past mental states remains unaltered. There may be additions of new subjective experiences and some mental states may be altogether forgotten, but no individual mental state is altered. The person's *sense of individuality* remains the same throughout these constant alterations in the brain substance.² It is able to survive all these changes, and it can survive also the complete destruction of the material substance of the brain.

This individuality arising from mental consciousness has its seat of existence, according to our philosophers, in an occult power or force which keeps a registry, as it

¹ The Impersonal Parabrahman thus being made to merge or separate itself into a personal "*jīvātma*," or the personal god of every human creature. This is, again, a difference necessitated by the Brāhmanical belief in a God whether personal or impersonal, while the Buddhist Arahats, rejecting this idea entirely, recognize *no deity* apart from man. See *Appendix*, Note V.

² [This is also sound Buddhist philosophy, the transformation in question being known as the change of the *skandhas*. — *Ed. Theos.*]

were, of all our mental impressions. The power itself is indestructible, though by the operation of certain antagonistic causes its impressions may in course of time be effaced, in part or wholly.

I may mention in this connection that our philosophers, have associated seven *occult* powers with the seven principles or entities above mentioned. These seven occult powers in the microcosm correspond with, or are the counterparts of, the occult powers in the macrocosm. The mental and spiritual consciousness of the individual becomes the general consciousness of *Brahman* when the barrier of individuality is wholly removed, and when the seven powers in the microcosm are placed *en rapport* with the seven powers in the macrocosm.

There is nothing very strange in a power or force, or *Śakti* carrying with it impressions of sensations, ideas, thoughts, or other subjective experiences. It is now a well-known fact, that an electric or magnetic current can convey in some mysterious manner impressions of sound or speech with all their individual peculiarities; similarly, you know very well that I can convey my thoughts to you by a transmission of energy or power.

Now this fifth principle represents in our philosophy *the mind*, or, to speak more correctly, the power or force above described, the impressions of the mental states therein, and the notion of individuality or *Ahamkāra* generated by their collective operation. This principle is called merely *physical intelligence* in your article. I do not know what is really meant by this expression. It may be taken to mean that intelligence which exists in a very low state of development in the lower animals. *Mind* may exist in different stages of development, from the very lowest forms of organic life, where the signs of its existence or operation can hardly be distinctly realized, up to man, in whom it reaches its highest state of development.

In fact, from the first appearance of life¹ up to *Turiya Avasthā*, or the state of Nirvana, the progress is, as it were, continuous. We ascend from that principle up to the seventh by almost imperceptible gradations. But four stages are recognized in the progress where the change is of a peculiar kind, and is such as to arrest an observer's attention. These four stages are as follows:

- 1 Where life (fourth principle) makes its appearance.
- 2 Where the existence of mind becomes perceptible in conjunction with life.
- 3 Where the highest state of mental abstraction ends, and *spiritual consciousness* commences.
- 4 Where spiritual consciousness disappears, leaving the seventh principle in a complete state of *Nirvana*, or nakedness.

According to our philosophers, the fifth principle under consideration is intended to represent *the mind in every possible state of development, from the second stage up to the third stage.*

¹ In the Aryan doctrine which blends *Brahman*, *Śakti*, and *Prakriti* in one, it is the fourth principle, then; in the Buddhist esotericism the second in combination with the first.

VI Brahman and Śakti This principle corresponds to your “spiritual intelligence.” It is, in fact, *Buddhi* (I use the word *Buddhi* not in the ordinary sense, but in the sense in which it is used by our ancient philosophers); in other words, it is the seat of *Bodha* or *Ātmabodha*. One who has *Ātmabodha* in its completeness is a *Buddha*. *Buddhists know very well what this term signifies*. This principle is described in your article as an entity coming into existence by the combination of *Brahman* and *Prakriti*. I do not again know in what particular sense the word *Prakriti* is used in this connection. According to our philosophers it is an entity arising from the union of *Brahman* and *Śakti*. I have already explained the connotation attached by our philosophers to the words *Prakriti* and *Śakti*.

I stated that *Prakriti* in its *primary* state is *Ākāśa*.¹

If *Ākāśa* be considered to be *Śakti* or Power by Theosophists,² then my statement as regards the ultimate state of *Prakriti* is likely to give rise to confusion and misapprehension unless I explain the distinction between *Ākāśa* and *Śakti*. *Ākāśa* is not, properly speaking, the *Crown of the Astral light*, nor does it *by itself* constitute any of the *six primary forces*. But, generally speaking, whenever any *phenomenal result* is produced, *Śakti* acts in *conjunction with Ākāśa*. And, moreover, *Ākāśa* serves as a basis or *Adhithāna* for the transmission of force currents and for the formation of force or power correlations.³

In *Mantraśāstra* the letter *Ha* represents *Ākāśa*, and you will find that this syllable enters into most of the sacred formulae intended to be used in producing phenomenal results. But by itself it does not represent any *Śakti*. You may, if you please, call *Śakti* an attribute of *Ākāśa*.

I do not think that as regards the nature of this principle there can, in reality, exist any difference of opinion between the Buddhist and Brāhmanical philosophers.

Buddhist and Brāhmanical initiates know very well that mysterious circular mirror composed of two hemispheres which reflects as it were the rays emanating from the “burning bush” and the blazing star — the, Spiritual sun shining in CHIDĀKĀŚA.

The spiritual impressions constituting this principle have their existence in an occult power associated with the entity in question. The successive incarnations of Buddha, in fact, mean the successive transfers of this mysterious power or the impressions thereon. The transfer is only possible when the *Mahatma*⁴ who transfers it, has completely identified himself with his seventh principle, has annihilated his

¹ According to the Buddhists in *Ākāśa* lies that eternal, potential energy whose function it is to evolve all visible things out of itself.

² It was never so considered, as we have shown it. But as the “Fragments” are written in English, a language lacking such an abundance of metaphysical terms to express every minute change of form, substance and state as found in the Sanskrit, it was deemed useless to confuse the Western reader untrained in the methods of Eastern expression—more than necessary, with a too nice distinction of proper technical terms. As “*Prakriti* in its primary state is *Ākāśa*,” and *Śakti* “is an attribute of ĀKĀŚA,” it becomes evident that for the uninitiated it is all one. Indeed, to speak of the “union of Brahman and Prakriti” instead of “Brahman and *Śakti*,” is no worse than for a theist to write that “man has come into existence by the combination of spirit and matter,” whereas, his words framed in an orthodox shape, ought to read “man as a living soul was created by the power (or breath) of God over matter.”

³ That is to say, the Āryan *Ākāśa* is another word for Buddhist SPACE (in its metaphysical meaning).

⁴ The highest adept.

Ahamkāra and reduced it to ashes in CHIDĀGNIKUNDA and has succeeded in making his thoughts correspond with the eternal laws of nature and in becoming a co-worker with nature. Or to put the same thing in other words, when he *has attained the state of Nirvana, the condition of final negation, negation of individual or separate existence.*¹

VII Atma The emanation from the absolute, corresponding to the seventh principle. As regards this entity there exists positively no real difference of opinion between the Tibetan Buddhist adepts and our ancient Rishis.

We must now consider which of these entities can appear after the individual's death in *séance* rooms and produce the so-called spiritualistic phenomena.

Now, the assertion of the Spiritualists that the "disembodied spirits" of particular human beings appear in *séance* rooms necessarily implies that the entity that so appears bears the stamp of some particular individual's *individuality*?

So, we have to ascertain beforehand in what entity or entities individuality has its seat of existence. Apparently it exists in the person's particular formation of body, and in his subjective experiences (called his mind in their totality). On the death of the individual his body is destroyed; his *lingaśarīra* being decomposed, the power associated with it becomes mingled in the current of the corresponding powers in the macrocosm. Similarly, the third and fourth principles are mingled with their corresponding powers. These entities may again enter into the composition of other organisms. As these entities bear no impression of individuality, the Spiritualists have no right to say that the "*disembodied spirit*" of the human being has appeared in the *séance* room whenever any of these entities may appear there. In fact, they have no means of ascertaining that they belonged to any particular individual.

Therefore, we must only consider whether any of the last three entities appear in *séance* rooms to amuse or to instruct Spiritualists. Let us take three particular examples of individuals and see what becomes of these three principles after death.

- 1 One in whom spiritual attachments have greater force than terrestrial attachments.
- 2 One in whom spiritual aspirations do exist, but are merely of secondary importance to him, his terrestrial interests occupying the greater share of his attention.
- 3 One in whom there exist no spiritual aspirations whatsoever, one whose spiritual Ego is dead or non-existent to his apprehension.

We need not consider the case of a *complete Adept* in this connection. In the first two cases, according to our supposition, spiritual and mental experiences exist together; when spiritual consciousness exists, the existence of the seventh principle being recognized, it maintains its connection with the fifth and sixth principles. But the existence of terrestrial attachments creates the necessity of *Punarjanman*, the latter signi-

¹ In the words of a gatha in the *Mahā-pari-nirvāna-Sūtra*,
We reach a condition of Rest
Beyond the limit of any human knowledge.

ifying the evolution of a new set of objective and subjective experiences, constituting a new combination of surrounding circumstances or, in other words, a new world. The period between death and the next subsequent birth is occupied with the preparation required for the evolution of these new experiences. During the period of incubation, as you call it, the spirit will never of its own accord appear in this world, *nor can it so appear*.

There is a great law in this universe which consists in the reduction of subjective experiences to objective phenomena and the evolution of the former from the latter. This is otherwise called “cyclic necessity.” Man is subjected to this law if he does not check and counterbalance the usual destiny or fate, and he can only escape its control by subduing all his terrestrial attachments completely. The new combination of circumstances under which he will then be placed may be better or worse than the terrestrial conditions under which he lived. But in his progress to a new world, you may be sure he will never turn around to have a look at his spiritualistic friends.¹

In the third of the above three cases there is by our supposition, no recognition of spiritual consciousness or of spirit. So they are non-existing so far as he is concerned. The case is similar to that of an organ of faculty which remains unused for a long time. It then practically ceases to exist.

These entities, as it were, remain his or in his possession, when they are stamped with the stamp of recognition. When such is not the case, the whole of his individuality is centred in his fifth principle. And after death this fifth principle is the *only representative* of the individual in question.

By itself it cannot evolve for itself a new set of objective experiences, or to say the same thing in other words, it has no *Punarjanman*. It is such an entity that can appear in *séance* rooms; but it is absurd to call it a *disembodied spirit*² It is merely a power or force retaining the impressions of the thoughts or ideas of the individual into whose composition it originally entered. It sometimes summons to its aid the *Kāmarūpa* power, and creates for itself some particular ethereal form (not necessarily human).

Its tendencies of action will be similar to those of the individual’s mind when he was living. This entity maintains its existence so long as the impressions on the power associated with the fifth principle remain intact. In course of time they are effaced, and the power in question is then mixed up in the current of its corresponding power in the MACROCOSM, as the river loses itself in the sea. Entities like these may afford signs of their having been considerable intellectual power in the individuals to which they belonged; because very high intellectual power may co-exist with utter absence of spiritual consciousness. But from this circumstance it cannot be argued that either the spirits or the spiritual Egos of deceased individuals appear in *séance* rooms.

¹ As M.A. (Oxon.) will see, the Spiritualists have still less chance of having their claims recognized by Brāhmanical than by Buddhist occultists.

² It is especially on this point that the Aryan and Arhat doctrines quite agree. The teaching and argument that follow are, in every respect, those of the Buddhist Himalayan Brotherhood.

There are some people in India who have thoroughly studied the nature of such entities (called *Piśācha*). I do not know much about them experimentally, as I have never meddled with this disgusting, profitless, and dangerous branch of investigation.

Your Spiritualists do not know what they are really doing. Their investigations are likely to result in course of time either in wicked sorcery or in the utter spiritual ruin of thousands of men and women.¹

The views I have herein expressed have been often illustrated by our ancient writers by comparing the course of a man's life or existence to the orbital motion of a planet round the sun. Centripetal force is spiritual attraction and centrifugal terrestrial attraction. As the centripetal force increases in power in comparison with the centrifugal force, the planet approaches the sun — the individual reaches a higher plane of existence. If, on the other hand, the centrifugal force becomes greater than the centripetal force, the planet is removed to a greater distance from the sun, and moves in a new orbit at that distance — the individual comes to a lower level of existence. These are illustrated in the first two instances I have noticed above.

We have only to consider the two extreme cases.

When the planet in its *approach* to the sun passes over the line where the centripetal and centrifugal forces completely neutralize each other and is only acted on by the centripetal force, it rushes towards the sun with a gradually increasing velocity and is finally mixed up with the mass of the sun's body. This is the case of a complete *adept*.

Again, when the planet in its *retreat* from the sun reaches a point where the centrifugal force becomes all-powerful it flies off in a tangential direction from its orbit, and goes into the depths of void space. When it ceases to be under the control of the sun, it gradually gives up its generative heat and the creative energy that it originally derived from the sun and remains a cold mass of material wandering through space until the mass is completely decomposed into atoms. This cold mass is compared to the fifth principle under the conditions above noticed, and the heat, light, and energy that left it are compared to the sixth and seventh principles.

Either after assuming a new orbit or in its course of deviation from the old orbit to the new, the planet can never go back to any point in its old orbit, as the various orbits lying in different planes never intersect each other.

This figurative representation correctly explains the ancient Brāhmanical theory on the subject. It is merely a branch of what is called the Great Law of the Universe by the ancient mystics . . .

¹ We share entirely in this idea.

Editorial Appendix

By H.P. Blavatsky, Editor of *The Theosophist*

From *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (EDITORIAL NOTES TO SUBBA ROW'S ARYAN-ARHAT TENETS ON THE SEVENFOLD PRINCIPLE IN MAN) III pp. 418-24.

Note I

In this connection it will be well to draw the reader's attention, to the fact that the country called "Si-dzang" by the Chinese, and Tibet by Western geographers, is mentioned in the oldest books preserved in the province of Fokien (the chief headquarters of the aborigines of China) — as the great seat of occult learning in the archaic ages. According to these records, it was inhabited by the "Teachers of Light," the "Sons of Wisdom" and the "Brothers of the Sun." The Emperor Yu the "Great" (2207 B.C.), a pious mystic, is credited with having obtained his occult wisdom and the system of theocracy established by him — for he was the first one in China to unite ecclesiastical power with temporal authority — from Si-dzang. That system was the same as with the old Egyptians and the Chaldees; that which we know to have existed in the Brāhmanical period in India, and to exist now in Tibet: namely, all the learning, power, the temporal as well as the secret wisdom were concentrated within the hierarchy of the priests and limited to their caste. Who were the aborigines of Tibet is a question which no ethnographer is able to answer correctly at present. They practice the Bön religion, their sect is a pre- and anti-Buddhistic one, and they are to be found mostly in the province of Kham — that is all that is known of them. But even that would justify the supposition that they are the greatly degenerated descendants of mighty and wise forefathers. Their ethnical type shows that they are not pure Turanians, and their rites — now those of sorcery, incantations, and nature worship, remind one far more of the popular rites of the Babylonians, as found in the records preserved on the excavated cylinders, than of the religious practices of the Chinese sect of Tao-sse — (a religion based upon pure reason and spirituality) — as alleged by some. Generally, little or no difference is made even by the Khelang missionaries who mix greatly with these people on the borders of British Lahul — and ought to know better — between the Böns and the two rival Buddhist sects, the Yellow Caps and the Red Caps. The latter of these have opposed the reform of Tsong-Kha-pa from the first and have always adhered to old Buddhism so greatly mixed up now with the practices of the Böns. Were our Orientalists to know more of them, and compare the ancient Babylonian Bel or Baal worship with the rites of the Böns, they would find an undeniable connection between the two. To begin an argument here, proving the origin of the aborigines of Tibet as connected with one of the three great races which superseded each other in Babylonia, whether we call them the Akkadians (invented by F. Lenormant), or the primitive Turanians, Chaldees and Assyrians — is out of the question. Be it as it may, there is reason to call the trans-Himalayan esoteric doctrine, Chaldeo-Tibetan. And, when we remember that the *Vedas* came — agreeably to all traditions — from the Mānasarovara Lake in Tibet, and the Brahmans themselves from the far North, we are justified in looking on the esoteric doctrines of every people who once had or still have it — as having proceeded from one and the same source; and, to thus call it the "Āryan-Chaldeo-Tibetan" doctrine, or Universal WIS-

DOM — Religion. “Seek for the LOST WORD¹ among the hierophants of Tartary, China and Tibet,” was the advice of Swedenborg, the seer.

Note II

Not necessarily — we say. The *Vedas*, Brahmanism, and along with these, Sanskrit, were importations into what we now regard as India. They were never indigenous to its soil. There was a time when the ancient nations of the West included under the generic name of India many of the countries of Asia now classified under other names. There was an Upper, a Lower, and a Western India, even during the comparatively late period of Alexander; and Persia-Iran is called Western India in some ancient classics. The countries now named Tibet, Mongolia, and Great Tartary were considered by them as forming part of India. When we say, therefore, that India has civilized the world and was the *Alma Mater* of the civilizations, arts and sciences of all other nations (Babylonia, and perhaps even Egypt, included) we mean archaic, pre-historic India, India of the time when the great Gobi was a sea, and the lost “Atlantis” formed part of an unbroken continent which began at the Himalayas and ran down over Southern India, Ceylon, Java, to faraway Tasmania.

Note III

To ascertain such disputed questions, one has to look into and study well the Chinese sacred and historical records — a people whose era begins nearly 4,600 years back (2697 B.C.). A people so accurate and by whom some of the most important *inventions* of modern Europe and its so much boasted modern science were anticipated — such as the compass, gunpowder, porcelain, paper, printing, *etc.*, known, and practiced thousands of years before these were re-discovered by the Europeans — ought to receive some trust for their records. And from Lao-tze down to Hiuen-Tsang their literature is filled with allusions and references to that island and the wisdom of the Himalayan adepts. In *A Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese*, by the Rev. Samuel Beal, there is a chapter “On the Tian-Ta’i School of Buddhism,”² which our opponents ought to read. Translating the rules of that most celebrated and holy school and sect in China founded by Chinche-K’hae, called Che-chay (the wise one) in the year 575 of our era, when coming to the sentence which reads: “That which relates to the one garment [seamless] worn by the GREAT TEACHERS OF THE SNOWY MOUNTAINS (the school of the Haimavatas)”³ the European translator places after the last sentence a sign of interrogation, as well he may. The statistics of the school of the “Haimavatas” or of our Himalayan Brotherhood, are not to be found in the General Census Records of India. Further, Mr. Beal translates a Rule relating to “the great professors of the higher order, who live in mountain depths remote from men,” the *Āranyakas*, or hermits.

So, with respect to the traditions concerning this island, and apart from the (to them) *historical* records of this preserved in the Chinese and Tibetan Sacred Books: the legend is alive to this day among the people of Tibet. The fair Island is no more, but the country where it once bloomed remains there still, and the spot is well known to

¹ [See “The Ineffable Name” in our Secret Doctrine’s First Proposition Series.]

² pp. 244-258

³ p. 256

some of the “great teachers of the snowy mountains,” however much convulsed and changed its topography by the awful cataclysm. Every *seventh* year, these teachers are believed to assemble in *Śambhala*, the “happy land.” According to the general belief it is situated in the North-West of Tibet. Some place it within the unexplored central regions, inaccessible even to the fearless nomadic tribes; others hem it in between the range of the Gangdisri Mountains and the northern edge of the Gobi Desert, South and North, and the more populated regions of Kunduz and Kashmir, of the *Gya-Pheling* (British India), and China, West and East, which affords to the curious mind a pretty large latitude to locate it in. Others still place it between Namur-Nor and the Kuen-Lun Mountains — but one and all firmly believe in *Śambhala*, and speak of it as a fertile, fairylike land, once an island, now an oasis of incomparable beauty, the place of meeting of the inheritors of the esoteric wisdom of the godlike inhabitants of the legendary Island.¹

In connection with the archaic legend of the Asian Sea and the Atlantic Continent, is it not profitable to note a fact known to all modern geologists — that the Himalayan slopes afford geological proof, that the substance of those lofty peaks was once a part of an ocean floor?

Note IV

We have already pointed out that, in our opinion, the whole difference between Buddhist and Vedāntic philosophies was that the former was a kind of *rationalistic* Vedāntism, while the latter might be regarded as *transcendental* Buddhism. If the Āryan esotericism applies the term *jīvātma* to the seventh principle, the pure and *per se* unconscious spirit — it is because the Vedanta postulating three kinds of existence,

- 1 The pāramāthika (the true, the only real one),
- 2 The vyāvahārika (the practical), and
- 3 The pratibhāsika (the apparent or illusory life) — makes the first life or jīva, the only truly existent one.

Brahma or the ONE SELF is its only representative in the universe, as it is the *universal life in toto* while the other two are but its “phenomenal appearances,” imagined and created by ignorance, and complete illusions suggested to us by our blind senses. The Buddhists, on the other hand, deny either subjective or objective reality even to that one Self-Existence. Buddha declares that there is neither Creator nor an ABSOLUTE Being. Buddhist rationalism was ever too alive to the insuperable difficulty of admitting one absolute consciousness, as in the words of Flint — “wherever there is consciousness there is relation, and wherever there is relation there is dualism.” The

¹ [The Gangdisri Range is also known as Tisse-Gangrī and Kailas Range. It runs parallel to, and to the North of, the Himālayas, and in its Eastern part blends into the Nyenchantangha Range. Towards its Western portion, not far from the sources of the Indus River, rises the majestic pyramidal massif of Kailas (22,000 feet), called by the Tibetans Tisse. Some geographers consider this range to be merely the prolongation of the Karakorum Mountains. Kailas is not far from the sacred Lake of Manasa-sarovara.

Namur-Nor is a lake in the Northern part of the province of Gnari-Khorsum, at approximately the 34th degree of Northern Latitude.

It is obvious that H.P. Blavatsky, in speaking of the geographical location of the land of Śambhala, hides more than she reveals, as the area which she mentions extends over enormous distances in all directions. — *Boris de Zirkoff*.]

ONE LIFE is either “MUKTA” (absolute and unconditioned) and can have no relation to anything nor to any one; or it is “BADDHA” (bound and conditioned), and then it cannot be called the ABSOLUTE; the limitation, moreover, necessitating another deity as powerful as the first to account for all the evil in this world. Hence, the Arahat secret doctrine on cosmogony admits but of one absolute, indestructible, eternal, and uncreated UNCONSCIOUSNESS (so to translate), of an element (the word being used for want of a better term) absolutely independent of everything else in the universe; a something ever present or ubiquitous, a Presence which ever was, is, and will be, whether there is a God, gods or none; whether there is a universe or no universe; existing during the eternal cycles of Mahā Yugas, during the *Pralayas* as during the periods of *Manvantara*: and this is SPACE, the field for the operation of the eternal Forces and natural Law, the *basis* (as our correspondent rightly calls it) upon which take place the eternal intercorrelations of Ākāśa-Prakriti, guided by the unconscious regular pulsations of Śakti — the breath or power of a conscious deity, the theists would say — the eternal energy of an eternal, unconscious Law, say the Buddhists. Space then, or *Fan, Bar-nang (Mahā-Śūnyatā)* or, as it is called by Lao-tze, the “Emptiness” is the nature of the Buddhist Absolute.¹ The word *jīva* then, could never be applied by the Arahats to the *Seventh* Principle, since it is only through its correlation or contact with matter that *Fo-hat* (the Buddhist active energy) can develop active *conscious* life; and that to the question “how can *Unconsciousness* generate *consciousness*?” the answer would be: “Was the seed which generated a Bacon or a Newton self-conscious?”

Note V

To our European readers: Deceived by the phonetic similarity, it must not be thought that the name “Brahman” is identical in this connection with Brahmā or *Īśvara* — the personal God. The *Upanishads* the Vedānta Scriptures — mention no such God and, one would vainly seek in them any allusions to a conscious deity. The Brahman, or Parabrahm, the ABSOLUTE of the Vedāntins, is neuter and unconscious, and has no connection with the masculine Brahmā of the Hindu Triad, or *Trimūrti*. Some Orientalists rightly believe the name derived from the verb “brih,” to *grow* or *increase*, and to be, in this sense, the *universal expansive force of nature*, the vivifying and spiritual principle, or power, spread throughout the universe and which in its collectivity is the one Absoluteness, the one Life and the only Reality.²



¹ See Confucius’ “Praise of the Abyss.”

² *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, III pp. 400-24