

*Madame Blavatsky
cuts down to size the
Venerable Swami of Almora*



Contents and abstract of central ideas

Madame Blavatsky on the Venerable Paramahansa of Almora

And on the Advaita philosophy in general and our failings in particular.	3
Blavatsky cuts down to size the Venerable Swami.	
No “merging” or absorption can take place without dissolution, and an absolute annihilation of the previous form.	5
The venerable Paramahansa claims that he had “composed” himself into the state of Nirvikalpa, which Monier Williams defines as a state “destitute of all reflection.”	5
A mortal wound can be inflicted by the inner man upon another, neither by a real dagger nor by a hand of flesh, but simply by Will.	6
Spirit and Matter are illusionary aspects of the One Reality that veil Its ineffable splendour. These two ever-opposing forces are inseparable, interdependent, and interchangeable permutations of the One Life and Consciousness.	7
In a piece of wood or a stone there is as much latent spirit or life, as there is in a week-old human foetus.	7
Truth (Central Point) is everywhere: its outer boundary is nowhere.	
Eastern occult philosophy is the only one which can lead to true knowledge, for its starts from and proceeds only on principles clearly defined and accurately known.	9
Suggested reading for students.	
She being dead, yet speaketh.	10



Madame Blavatsky on the Venerable Paramahansa of Almora

And on the Advaita philosophy in general and our failings in particular.

First published in *The Theosophist*, Vol. IV, No. 10, July 1883, p. 245. Republished in *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (THE ALMORA SWAMI) IV pp. 560-62.

In our February number¹ prefacing the valuable though somewhat hazy contribution by the venerable Swami of Almora on “Advaita Philosophy,” we wrote the following editorial lines:

As the subjoined letter comes from such a learned source, we do not feel justified in commenting upon it editorially, our personal knowledge of the Advaita doctrine being unquestionably very meagre when contrasted with that of a Paramahansa — *hence* THE FOOTNOTES BY OUR LEARNED BROTHER, T. SUBBA ROW, TO WHOM WE TURNED OVER THE MS. FOR REPLY. [561]

This notice, we believe, was plain enough to screen us thereafter from any such personal remarks as are now flung at our head by the holy ascetic of Almora in the paper that follows. Some of those rhetorical blossoms having been left by us for the purpose of enlivening the otherwise too monotonous field of his philosophical subject, the reader may judge for himself. We say “some,” for, having to satisfy all our contributors, and our space being limited, we cannot consent to crowd out more interesting matter to make room for just fifteen and a half columns of quotations profusely mixed with reprimands and flings of any correspondent, even though the latter be as we learn from his own words, “a modest hermit of the jungle.” Therefore, with all our profound respect for our opponent, we had to curtail his too long paper considerably. We propose, however, to show him his chief mistake, and thus to blunt a few of the most pointed shafts intended to pierce through the points of the editorial harness.

If, after the humble confession quoted above from our February number, the editorial reply that followed another paper from the same ascetic, namely, “In re Advaita Philosophy,” in the March number — was still taken as emanating from one who had just confessed her incompetency to hold a disputation with the learned Swami upon Advaita tenets — the fault is not ours. This error is the more strange since the Swami had been clearly warned that his points would be disputed and questions answered in future by our brother Mr. T. Subba Row, as learned in Advaita philosophy as in the esotericism of the sacred books of the East. Therefore we had a right to expect that the *Paramahansa* would have remembered that he was ventilating his not over-kind remarks upon the wrong person, since *we had nothing to do personally* with the replies. Thus the disagreement upon various topics in general, and the abstruse tenets of esoteric Advaita Philosophy especially, between the “Almora Swami” and Mr. T. Subba Row, can in no way, or with any degree of justice, be laid by the [562] former at the door of either the “foreigners who have come to India for knowledge,” nor of

¹ See page 118.

“Western Theosophy”; for, in this particular case he has found an opponent (quite as learned, we love to think, as himself) in one of his own race and country — a real Advaitī Brahmin. To take therefore to task Theosophy for it or the conductor of this magazine, expressing dissatisfaction in such very strong terms, does not show either that philosophical equanimity, or tact and discrimination that might be expected from one who has devoted his life exclusively to meditation and the Yoga Philosophy. If pardonable in a person who has to lead that sort of life which in the words of Mr. Max Müller, quoted by the “Almora Swami” (as an additional hint and a *hit*, we suppose) a life “with telegrams, letters, newspapers, reviews, pamphlets, and books” — it is quite unpardonable in a holy ascetic, who is never troubled with anything of the sort and gets, as we suspect, even his appropriate quotations from European authors ready-made for him by his amanuenses and friends. But, since the article is addressed in the form of a letter to the editor, the humble individual who holds this office hastens to assure the venerable Swami that beyond their appalling length, his letters have never given the said editor one moment of “annoyance and trouble” as he seems to imagine.

In reference to another personal taunt, we agree with him. It is more than likely that some (not all by any means) Vedāntists, such as the modern “Aryas” and some Dvaites and Viśishtadvaites — after “hailing Western Theosophy with joy,” have ended by comparing it “to the mountain that gave birth to a mouse” — the disenchantment being due to many and various reasons upon which it is needless to enter at present. We can only hope and trust that the lofty Almorian mountain, chosen by our venerable friend as the seat of his contemplation, may not bring forth some day, for India, any worse animal than the humble “black mouse.” True we have come to *learn* in this country, and we have learned a good deal already. One fact, among several others, namely, that the learned ascetics of modern India have widely shot off from the original mark when [563] compared with the Rishis of old. Spinoza is quoted against us in his definition of methods of investigation. Our saintly critic fears that his venerable friends have followed the first (or vulgar) method. The proof which with him goes far to justify his “fear,” rests chiefly upon a *fallacy and mistake* of ours — one happily held by us in common with nearly all the great men of science in Europe, *viz.*, our *ignorant* claim THAT MATTER IS INDESTRUCTIBLE, HENCE ETERNAL. We will not understand his ideas, he says, because being fond of absurdities, “our own absurdity would be exposed.” If so, we prefer indeed our absurd belief in the indestructibility of matter to any scientific opinion upholding the contrary, submitting cheerfully, in this case, “the weakness of our understanding to be laughed at” — even by an ascetic in “the state of Nirvikalpa.”

We feel very grateful to the good Swami for his explanation of “Pravana” and other kindred words. Mr. Subba Row will no doubt profit by, and answer them. Personally, however, we respectfully decline to be taught the noble science by any other man, however learned he may be, than him who has originally undertaken the task — namely, our own MASTER: yet, as many of our readers may well benefit by the contro-

versy, we will, with his permission, leave the arena for the present to Mr. Subba Row, a far abler controversialist than we can ever hope to become.¹

Blavatsky cuts down to size the Venerable Swami.

No “merging” or absorption can take place without dissolution, and an absolute annihilation of the previous form.

First published in *The Theosophist*, Vol. IV, No. 10, July 1883, pp. 246-48. Republished in *Blavatsky Collected Writings* (FOOTNOTES TO “THE SWAMI OF ALMORA TO HIS OPPONENTS”) IV pp. 563-69.

[This is the article which H.P. Blavatsky refers to in the beginning of her own article “The Swami of Almora” which is published above. She appends a number of footnotes to various statements by the Swami. The Swami writes:

“In some of the former [564] numbers of *The Theosophist* the word *laya* was explained by you as merging, and in this number you give another meaning to it.”

H.P. Blavatsky replies:]

No “merging” or absorption can take place without *dissolution*, and an absolute annihilation of the previous form. The lump of sugar thrown into a cup of liquid must be dissolved and its form annihilated before it can be said to have been absorbed by, and in, the liquid. It is a correlation like any other in chemistry. Yet indestructible matter can as in the case of sugar, or any other chemical element, be recalled to life and even to its previous form. The molecule that cannot be divided by any physical means is divided by the universal solvent and resolved into something else. Hence — it is, for the time being, at least, annihilated in its form. This is simply a war on words.

[“It is odd that our phrase ‘present developed form’ has cost you more than a column to comment on it.” The comment, however, was from the pen of T. Subba Row. To this H.P. Blavatsky replies:]

It is still odder that a few footnotes should have cost the venerable Paramahansa over 15 columns of ill disguised abuse, out of which number three or four columns are given. That which was suppressed may be judged by what remains.

The venerable Paramahansa claims that he had “composed” himself into the state of Nirvikalpa, which Monier Williams defines as a state “destitute of all reflection.”

[“But, perhaps, nominal yogis, who are disturbed in head and heart, and cannot tranquilize and compose themselves for Nirvikalpa ecstasy, will not be able to comprehend us, nor also those who confound Prakriti with Purusha, or matter with spirit.”]

Surely our respected correspondent cannot mean to convey the idea that in penning this answer *he* had “composed” himself into the state of Nirvikalpa; unless we take

¹ [This has reference to Subba Row’s essay entitled “Prakriti and Purusha” in the same July number of *The Theosophist*, pp. 248-51.]

Monier Williams' definition of the term and bear in mind that it is a state "destitute of all reflection."¹

To this kind thrust we answer that we have never confounded Prakriti with Purusha any more than we have confused the North with the South Pole. As both Poles belong to the same and one earth, so spirit and matter, [565] or Purusha and Prakriti are the two ends that lose themselves in the eternity of unmanifested and the cycles of manifested matter.² But like some of our distinguished Western metaphysicians, our opponent seems to regard matter and energy as two distinct things, whereas the Esoteric doctrine recognizes but one substratum for everything visible as in visible — "Purush-Prakriti" and *vice versa*. Moreover, we may remind the good Swami, that one need not be a yogi to be a good Occultist, nor are there many yogis in India who know anything of real occult sciences.

[“Now according to our knowledge the inner man means the *double*, i.e., the Tajasa, Prajñā being the original or first, and the Annamaya or the Viśva, the third.”]

In such case, our respected critic ought to criticize and correct Professor Monier Williams and other Sanskritists, who regard *Anna-Maya* as the “covering supported by food, i.e., the corporeal form or gross body” calling it the *fourth*, while we name it as the *first* sheath or *Kośa*.³

[“To this third, we applied the term *treble*, and we are justified in doing so, in the same way as you apply double to the Tajasa — and we do not see any harm in taking the gross one as third; but those who are fond of absurdities will not understand our ideas.”]

We leave it to our readers to judge which is the most *absurd* — to consider our physical body as the *first*, or to call it, as the Swami does the *treble* or the third; though of course there is “no harm” in either.

[“Why, because their own absurdity will be exposed. We beg your pardon for this outspokenness.”]

We willingly forgive the impolite remark under its garb of “outspokenness.” We beg our respected correspondent to bear in mind though that it is one thing to be “outspoken,” and quite another one to be *rude*.

A mortal wound can be inflicted by the inner man upon another, neither by a real dagger nor by a hand of flesh, but simply by Will.

[“How can you, being a practical theosophist, say carelessly that, a mortal wound may be inflicted upon the inner man, etc., etc., when in reality the outer one was the victim. You evade our question in an offhand manner by saying that the [566] question is not whether the *double* murdered the double or tre-

¹ See *Indian Wisdom*, p. 112, fn. 3. [Sir Monier Monier-Williams, 1819–1899. *Indian wisdom, or, Examples of the religious, philosophical, and ethical doctrines of the Hindūs: with a brief history of the chief departments of Sanskrit literature, and some account of the past and present condition of India, moral and intellectual*. 4th ed., enlarged and improved. London: Luzac & Co., 1893; 575pp.

² [Consult “Modifications of Consciousness,” our Second Major Work. — ED. PHIL.]

³ See *Indian Wisdom*, p. 114.

ble.¹ Now we particularly begged you to remove our doubts by establishing this fact scientifically.”]

It is precisely because we claim to know something of “practical” Occultism in addition to being a Theosophist that we answer without in the least “evading the question” that a mortal wound may be inflicted “not only *upon*, but also by one” inner man upon another. This is the A.B.C. of esoteric mesmerism. The wound is inflicted by neither a real dagger nor a hand of flesh, bones, and blood, but simply *by* — WILL. It is the intense will of the “Gospoja” that guided the astral or inner body, the *Mayavi-Rupa* of Frozya. It is the passively obedient action of the latter’s “double” that scanning space and material obstacles, followed the “trail” of, and found, the real murderers. It is again that WILL shaped by the incessant thought of the revenger, that inflicted the internal wounds which though unable to kill or even to hurt the inner man, yet by reaction of the interior *physical* body proved mortal to the latter. If the fluid of the mesmerizer can cure, it can also kill. And now we have “established the fact as scientifically” — as science, which generally disbelieves in and rejects such mesmeric phenomena, will permit. For those who believe in, and know something of mesmerism, this will be plain. As to those who deny it the explanation will appear to them as absurd as any other psychological claim: as much so as the claims of Yogism with its beatitudes of *Samadhi* and other states, for the matter of that.

Spirit and Matter are illusionary aspects of the One Reality that veil Its ineffable splendour. These two ever-opposing forces are inseparable, interdependent, and interchangeable permutations of the One Life and Consciousness.

[“Is spirit and matter the same thing? . . . Unless Prakriti be the same with spirit, how can the former be eternal, since two eternals cannot exist at the same time, and the belief in two eternals is against the fundamental truths of the Advaita Philosophy . . . Matter has attributes . . . the spirit has none. Matter [567] is dead (jad), spirit is living (chaitanya); matter is temporary and subject to change, and spirit is eternal; matter is partial, and spirit is universal.”]

This is precisely the question we have been asking; and also the reason why, knowing that matter is indestructible, as also spirit or rather *energy* — we say with all the esoteric Advaitis that matter and spirit are ONE. While we mean cosmic indestructible matter, the Swami speaks of *objective* and *differentiated* matter.

In a piece of wood or a stone there is as much latent spirit or life, as there is in a week-old human foetus.

[“Why do you not call a piece of wood or stone spirit?”]

Because it is not usual to call them by such a name. Nevertheless, we maintain that there is in a piece of wood or a stone as much of latent spirit or life as there is in a week-old human foetus.

¹ [This statement, and some of H.P. Blavatsky’s remarks following it, have reference to H.P. Blavatsky’s story entitled “Can the ‘Double’ Murder?” which was republished in *The Theosophist*, Vol. IV, January 1883, pp. 99-101. Its original place of publication, however, was *The Sun*, New York, December 26th, 1875, and it may be found in Vol. I, pp. 163ff of the present Series. — Boris de Zirkoff.]

[“If matter is merely a manifestation of spirit, why call it by the false name of matter instead of its own name spirit?”]

For the same good reason that we call a chair by its “false” name of *chair* instead of calling it by that of the “oak” or any other wood of which it was made.

[“The esteemed Editor of *The Theosophist* seems to follow the doctrine of Madhyamika, i.e., middle class Buddhists . . .”]

The “esteemed Editor” follows but the doctrines of Esoteric Buddhism, which are nearly identical with those of the esoteric Advaitis — the *true* followers of Śankarāchārya.

[“The Buddhas believe that pure Nirvana alone exists. Nirvana is a transcendental condition. It is infinitude. It is not subject to being acted upon . . . Besides the Nirvana, karma or activity is also eternal.”]

And if “activity is *also eternal*,” how, then, can our philosophical antagonist maintain that matter is not so? Can *activity* (in the usual sense of the word), whether physical or mental, manifest itself or exist without, or outside of, *matter*, or to be plainer — outside of any one of the seven states? And how about his contradicting himself? “Activity also eternal.” Then there *are* after all *two* eternals; how? And he has just said that “two eternals cannot exist at the same time.” [568]

[“Aided by ignorance, activity produces five elements and develops worldliness . . . virtue and contemplation destroy the power of ignorance. Activity thus becomes impotent and Nirvana is next attained to.”]

We beg to draw our correspondent’s attention to the fact that he is again contradicting himself. Or is it the “Buddhas”? But a few lines above he declares “activity . . . *eternal*,” and now he makes it “impotent” — in other words, kills and annihilates that *which is eternal*!

[“Purusha, according to Upanishads, is Śvayam-Prakaśa, i.e., self-manifesting; therefore cannot be dependent on *Prakriti* only, for its manifestation. No *Advaiti* will take Brahman with *Prakriti* or *gun* or duality. Their Brahman is Purusha beyond the *Prakriti*, or in other words, Akshara. Latent spirit is never referred to as *Maha-Īśvara*. Please read the verse quoted below, which distinctly states that *Maha-Īśvara* is the spirit beyond *Prakriti* when the latter is *laya-ed*.”]

We beg to be explained the hidden meaning of this really incomprehensible sentence. “Latent spirit is never referred to as *Maha-Īśvara*” (a term *we*, at any rate, never used), while the Sanskrit verse “states that *Maha-Īśvara* is the spirit beyond *Prakriti*, when the latter is *laya-ed*.” Now does the learned Swami mean to say that the spirit beyond differentiated matter is *active*? It cannot mean anything else, for otherwise the two assumptions would contradict each other most absurdly and would be suicidal; and if he does mean that which he says, *viz.*, that *Maha-Īśvara* (if the latter is identified here with Parabrahm), the spirit *beyond* *Prakriti* becomes *active* since it is called *Maha-Īśvara*, which it would not be were it *latent* — then, we are sorry to say to the learned Paramahansa that he does not know what he is talking about. He is *no* Esoteric Advaiti and — we close the discussion as becoming quite useless.

["As the subject is very serious and important, we entreat you to discuss the point calmly and dispassionately; without this mood of mind, one cannot penetrate into the esoteric philosophy of India. Your present opinions are not esoteric, they are rather esoteric."]

Truth (Central Point) is everywhere: its outer boundary is nowhere.¹

Eastern occult philosophy is the only one which can lead to true knowledge, for its starts from and proceeds only on principles clearly defined and accurately known.

We sincerely regret that such should be the opinion of the Swami of Almora. But since we know [569] neither himself, nor the religion or school of philosophy he belongs to, we may perhaps repeat with him: "It does not, however, matter much" whether he agrees with us or not for practical (esoteric and initiated) Vedāntists have found our opinions correct and in perfect harmony with their own. There are nearly as many interpretations of the esoteric meaning of certain words we have to use as there are yogis and sannyasis of various sects in India. A Viśishtādvaita *yogi* will contend the correctness of the meaning as given by an Advaitī-ascetic, and a devotee of Chaitanya or a Bhakti-yogi will never accept the interpretation of the *Vedas* or *Bhagavad-Gita* made by a Brahmo or an Arya. Thus truth is everywhere and may be said to be nowhere. For us it is absolutely and solely in the Arhat esoteric doctrines; and — we remain firm in our conviction, all our opponents being quite as free as ourselves to adhere by their own views. We have met in the N.W.P. with an erudite Pundit, a renowned Sanskritist, the most learned authority with, and at the head of the Vaishnavas, and recognized as such by many others; and he wanted us to believe that the culmination of "Raj-yoga" was the practical and absolute powers it conferred upon the Raj-yogi over all the female sex in creation!! Shall we believe every exponent of the *Vedas*, the Śāstrī of every sect, only because he may be an authority to those who belong to the same denomination with him, or shall we make a judicious selection, following but the dictates of our reason, which tells us that he is most right and nearer to truth, who diverges the less from logic and — Science? The *occult* philosophy we study uses precisely that method of investigation which is termed by Spinoza the "scientific method." It starts from, and proceeds only on "principles clearly defined and accurately known," and is therefore "the only one" which can lead to true knowledge. Therefore, by this philosophy, and no other shall we abide. And now we must leave the venerable Swami and his views to the dissecting knife of Mr. T. Subba Row. — [H.P. BLAVATSKY]



¹ [Consult "Proposition 1 - Centre + Circle," in our Secret Doctrine's First Proposition Series. — ED. PHIL.]

Suggested reading for students.



She being dead, yet speaketh.

- BLAVATSKY ABOUT TO UNVEIL ISIS
- BLAVATSKY AGAINST ECCLESIASTICAL CHRISTIANITY
- BLAVATSKY AGAINST SPIRITUALISM
- BLAVATSKY CUTS DOWN TO SIZE A CARPING CRITIC OF HETERODOXY
- BLAVATSKY DEFENDS BUDDHISM IN CEYLON
- BLAVATSKY DEFENDS ISIS UNVEILED
- BLAVATSKY ENLIGHTENS HER READERS
- BLAVATSKY ENLIGHTENS THE SCEPTICS OF HER MOTHERLAND
- BLAVATSKY EXPELS A FRIEND OF COMMUNISTS
- BLAVATSKY HATED BALLS
- BLAVATSKY ON A CASE OF OBSESSION
- BLAVATSKY ON A HEAVY CURSE
- BLAVATSKY ON ANIMAL SOULS
- BLAVATSKY ON BULGARIAN SUN WORSHIP
- BLAVATSKY ON CHRISTMAS AND THE CHRISTMAS TREE
- BLAVATSKY ON ELEMENTALS AND ELEMENTARIES
- BLAVATSKY ON FOETICIDE BEING A CRIME AGAINST NATURE
- BLAVATSKY ON HINDU WIDOW-BURNING
- BLAVATSKY ON IRISH TALISMANS
- BLAVATSKY ON JESUITRY IN MASONRY
- BLAVATSKY ON MARRIAGE, DIVORCE, AND CELIBACY
- BLAVATSKY ON NEBO OF BIRS-NIMRUD
- BLAVATSKY ON OCCULT ALPHABETS AND NUMERALS
- BLAVATSKY ON OCCULT VIBRATIONS

BLAVATSKY SPEAKS SERIES
SUGGESTED READING FOR STUDENTS

- BLAVATSKY ON OLD AGE
- BLAVATSKY ON OLD DOCTRINES VINDICATED BY NEW PROPHETS
- BLAVATSKY ON PLATO'S TIMÆUS
- BLAVATSKY ON PROGRESS AND CULTURE
- BLAVATSKY ON RELIGIOUS DEFORMITIES
- BLAVATSKY ON RITUALISM IN CHURCH AND MASONRY
- BLAVATSKY ON SHAMBHALA, THE HAPPY LAND
- BLAVATSKY ON SPINOZA AND WESTERN PHILOSOPHERS
- BLAVATSKY ON SUNDAY DEVOTION TO PLEASURE
- BLAVATSKY ON TEACHINGS OF ELIPHAS LEVI
- BLAVATSKY ON THE BOOGEYMEN OF SCIENCE
- BLAVATSKY ON THE BOOK OF ENOCH
- BLAVATSKY ON THE CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES IN INDIA
- BLAVATSKY ON THE DOOMED DESTINY OF THE ROMANOVs
- BLAVATSKY ON THE ELUCIDATION OF LONG-STANDING ENIGMAS
- BLAVATSKY ON THE HARMONICS OF SMELL
- BLAVATSKY ON THE HIDDEN ESOTERICISM OF THE BIBLE
- BLAVATSKY ON THE HISTORY AND TRIBULATIONS OF THE ZOHAR
- BLAVATSKY ON THE INTROVERSION OF MENTAL VISION
- BLAVATSKY ON THE KEY TO SPIRITUAL PROGRESS
- BLAVATSKY ON THE KNIGHTED OXFORD SANSKRITIST WHO COULD SPEAK NO SANSKRIT
- BLAVATSKY ON THE LETTERS OF LAVATER
- BLAVATSKY ON THE LUMINOUS CIRCLE
- BLAVATSKY ON THE MODERN NEGATORS OF ANCIENT SCIENCE
- BLAVATSKY ON THE MONSOON
- BLAVATSKY ON THE NEW YEAR AND FALSE NOSES
- BLAVATSKY ON THE NEW YEAR'S MORROW
- BLAVATSKY ON THE QABBALAH BY ISAAC MYER
- BLAVATSKY ON THE QUENCHLESS LAMPS OF ALCHEMY
- BLAVATSKY ON THE RATIONALE OF FASTS
- BLAVATSKY ON THE ROOTS OF ZOROASTRIANISM

BLAVATSKY SPEAKS SERIES
SUGGESTED READING FOR STUDENTS

- BLAVATSKY ON THE SECRET DOCTRINE
- BLAVATSKY ON THE TEACHINGS OF ELIPHAS LEVI
- BLAVATSKY ON THE VISHISHTADVAITA PHILOSOPHY
- BLAVATSKY ON THEOSOPHY AND ASCETICISM
- BLAVATSKY ON WHETHER THE RISHIS EXIST TODAY
- BLAVATSKY REBUTS UNSPIRITUAL CONCEPTIONS ABOUT GOD
- BLAVATSKY UNMASKS THE TRINITY OF RIGHTEOUSNESS
- BLAVATSKY'S LAST WORDS
- BLAVATSKY'S OPEN LETTER TO HER CORRESPONDENTS
- GEMS FROM THE EAST
- INDUCTIVE REASONING LEADS TO FAKE DEDUCTIONS
- MADAME BLAVATSKY ENLIGHTENS THE SCEPTICS OF HER MOTHERLAND
- MADAME BLAVATSKY ON THE PHILOSOPHICAL MIND OF THE CHINESE
- OBITUARY TO MIKHAIL NIKIFOROVICH KATKOV
- OBITUARY TO PUNDIT DAYANAND SARASWATI
- OCCULT PHILOSOPHY IS ANCIENT SPIRITUALISM
- OPEN LETTER TO THE AMERICAN SECTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
- OPEN LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY
- OPEN LETTERS TO THE AMERICAN CONVENTION
- PAGES FROM ISIS UNVEILED
- PAGES FROM THE CAVES AND JUNGLES OF HINDOSTAN
- PAGES FROM THE SECRET DOCTRINE 1 - ABRIDGED
- PAGES FROM THE SECRET DOCTRINE 2 - FULL TEXT
- PANTHEISTIC THEOSOPHY IS IRRECONCILABLE WITH ROMAN CATHOLICISM
- ROSICRUCIANISM WAS AN OFFSHOOT OF ORIENTAL OCCULTISM
- ROSICRUCIANS EMERGED AS AN ANTIDOTE TO THE MATERIAL SIDE OF ALCHEMY
- THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS FAR MORE DREADED BY THE DEVIL THAN BY GOD HIMSELF
- THE HERMETIC FIRE OF THE MIND IS THE KEY TO THE OCCULT SCIENCES
- THE REAL MEANING OF THE FIRST LINE OF GENESIS
- THE SECRET DOCTRINE (1888) VOL. 1 OF 2 ON COSMOGENESIS
- THE SECRET DOCTRINE (1888) VOL. 2 OF 2 ON ANTHROPOGENESIS

BLAVATSKY SPEAKS SERIES
SUGGESTED READING FOR STUDENTS

- THOTH IS THE EQUIVALENT OF HERMES AND MOSES
- UNPOPULAR PHILOSOPHER ON CRITICISM AND AUTHORITIES
- UNPOPULAR PHILOSOPHER ON THE EIGHTH WONDER
- UNPOPULAR PHILOSOPHER ON THE MORNING STAR
- WE ARE MORE OFTEN VICTIMS OF WORDS RATHER THAN OF FACTS
- WITHOUT THE REVIVAL OF ARYAN PHILOSOPHY, THE WEST WILL FALL TO EVEN GROSSER MATERIALISM

