

Date of Gautama Buddha's Disincarnation



Part 1. By Helena Petrovna Blavatsky

Responding to a question from F.W.H. Myers, English F.T.S.,¹ arising from A.P. Sinnett's "Esoteric Buddhism."²

From *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (ENQUIRIES SUGGESTED BY SINNETT'S "ESOTERIC BUDDHISM") Vol. V, Question VII: Philological and Archæological "Difficulties" — Shakya Muni's Place in History; pp. 241-59.

No Orientalist — save perhaps, the same wise, not to say deep, Prof. Weber — opposes more vehemently than Prof. Max Müller Hindu and Buddhist chronology. Evidently — if an Indophile he is not a Buddhophile, and General Cunningham — however independent otherwise in his archæological researches — agrees with him more than would seem strictly prudent in view of *possible* future discoveries.³ We have then to refute in our turn this great Oxford professor's speculations.

To the evidence furnished by the *Purānas* and the *Mahāvansa* — which he also finds hopelessly entangled and contradictory (though the perfect accuracy of that Sinhalese history is most warmly acknowledged by Sir Emerson Tennent, the historian) he opposes the Greek classics and their chronology. With him, it is always "Alexander's invasion" and "Conquest," and "the ambassador of Seleucus Nicator — Megasthenes" — while even the faintest record of such "conquest" is conspicuously absent from Brāhmanic record; and, although in an inscription of Piyadasi are mentioned the names of Antiochus, Ptolemy, Magas, Antigonus, *and even of the great Alexander himself, as vassals* of the king Piyadasi, the Macedonian is yet called the "Conqueror of India." In other words, while any casual mention of Indian affairs by a Greek writer of no great note must be accepted unchallenged, no record of the Indians, literary or monumental, is entitled to the smallest consideration. Until rubbed against the

¹ [Fellow of the Theosophical Society]

² [Students to consult "Early theosophical doctrines expounded by H.P. Blavatsky," in our Theosophy and Theosophists Series, and "Related titles for deeper study," on page 17 of this study. — ED. PHIL.]

³ Notwithstanding Prof. M. Müller's regrettable efforts to invalidate every Buddhist evidence, he seems to have ill-succeeded in proving his case, if we can judge from the openly expressed opinion of his own German *confrères*. In the portion headed "Tradition as to Buddha's age" (pp. 287-88) in his *The History of Indian Literature*, Prof. Weber very aptly remarks "Nothing like positive certainty therefore, is for the present attainable." "Nor have the subsequent discussions of this topic by Max Müller (1859), *Hist. A.S.L.*, p. 264ff., by Westergaard (1860), *Über Buddha's Todesjahr* (Breslau, 1862), and by Kern, *Over de Jaartelling der zuidelijke Buddhisten* (1873), so far yielded any definite result." [Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 288, fn. 342] Nor are they likely to.

touchstone of Hellenic infallibility it must be set down in the words of Prof. Weber — as “of course mere empty boasting.” Oh, rare Western sense of justice!¹

Occult records show differently. They say challenging proof to the contrary — that Alexander never penetrated into India farther than *Taxila*; which is not even quite the modern Attock. The murmuring of the Macedonian's troops began at the same place and not as given out, at Hyphasis. For having never gone to *Hydaspes* or *Jhelum* he could not have been at *Sutlej*. Nor did Alexander ever found satrapies or plant any Greek colonies in the Punjab. The only colonies he left behind him that the Brahmans ever knew of, amounted to a few dozens of disabled soldiers, scattered hither and thither on the frontiers; who, with their native raped wives settled around the deserts of *Karmania* and *Drangiane*² — the then natural boundaries of India. And, unless History regards as colonists the many thousands of dead men and those who *settled* for ever under the hot sands of *Gedrosia*, there were no other, save in the fertile imagination of the Greek *historians*. The boasted “invasion of India” was confined to the regions between *Karmania* and *Attock* — East and West, and *Beloochistan* and the *Hindukush* — South and North: countries which were all India for the Greek of those days. His building a *fleet* at *Hydaspes* is a fiction; and his “victorious march through the fighting armies of India” — another. However, it is not with the “world conqueror” that we have now to deal, but rather with the supposed accuracy and even casual veracity of his captains and countrymen, whose hazy reminiscences on the testimony of the classical writers have now been raised to unimpeachable evidence in everything that may affect the chronology of early Buddhism and India.

Foremost among the evidence of classical writers, that of *Flavius Arrianus*, is brought forward against the Buddhist and Chinese chronologies. No one should impeach the *personal* testimony of this conscientious author had he been himself an eye-witness instead of *Megasthenes*. But when a man comes to know that he wrote his accounts upon the now lost works of *Aristobulus* and *Ptolemy*; and that the latter described their data from texts prepared by authors who had never set their eyes *upon one line written by either Megasthenes or Nearchus himself*; and that knowing so much one is informed by Western historians that among the works of *Arrian*, Book VII of the *Anabasis of Alexander*, is “the chief authority on the subject of the Indian invasion — a book unfortunately *with a gap* in its 12th chapter” — one may well conceive upon what a broken reed Western authority leans for its Indian chronology. Ar-

¹ No *Philario* would pretend for a moment on the strength of the *Piyadasi* inscriptions that Alexander of Macedonia or either of the other sovereigns mentioned, was claimed as an actual “vassal” of *Chandragupta*. They did not even pay tribute, but only a kind of quit-rent annually for lands ceded in the north: as the grant-tablets could show. But the inscription, however misinterpreted, shows most clearly that Alexander was never the conqueror of India.

² [Annotation by *Boris de Zirkoff*: *Karmania* or *Carmania* (Καρμανία), mentioned by *Strabo* (*Geography*, xv, 726) and *Flavius Arrianus* (*Anabasis of Alexander*, vi, 28), was an extensive province of the ancient Persian Empire, along the North side of the Persian Gulf, extending from *Carpella* on the East, to the river *Bagrades* (*Nabend*) on the West. It was bounded on the West by *Persis*, on the North by *Parthia* and *Ariana*, on the East by *Drangiane* and *Gedrosia*, and on the South by the Persian Gulf. It was divided into *Carmania Propria* and *Carmania Deserta*. Its chief city was *Carmana* (present *Kirman*) which gives its name to the province.

Drangiana or *Drangiane* (Δραγγιανή), mentioned by *Strabo* (*Geography*, xi, 516), *Ammianus Marcellinus* (*Rerum gestarum*, xxiii, 6) and others, was a province at the Eastern end of the Persian Empire, including part of the present *Sejestan*. It was bounded on the West by *Carmania*, on the North by *Aria*, on the East by *Arachosia*, and on the South by *Gedrosia*. It formed for a time a separate satrapy. It was watered mainly by the river *Erymanthus* (or *Erymandrus*). In its Northern part, it was inhabited by the war-like *Drangæ*, whose capital was *Prophtasia*.]

rian lived over 600 years after Buddha's death; Strabo — 500 (55 “B.C.”); Diodorus Siculus — quite a trustworthy compiler! — about the 1st century; Plutarch over 700 *Anno Buddhæ* and Quintus Curtius over 1000 years! And when, to crown this army of witnesses against the Buddhist annals, the reader is informed by our Olympian critics that the works of the last named author — than whom no more blundering (geographically, chronologically and historically) writer ever lived — “form along with the Greek History of Arrian *the most valuable source of information* respecting the military career of Alexander the Great” — then the only wonder is that the great conqueror was not made by his biographers to have — Leonidas-like — defended the Thermopylæan passes in the Hindu-Kush against the invasion of the first Vedic Brahmans “from the Oxus.” Withal the Buddhist dates are either rejected or — accepted *pro tempore*. Well may the Hindu resent the preference shown to the testimony of Greeks — of whom some at least, are better remembered in Indian History as the importers into Jambu-dvīpa of every Greek and Roman vice known and unknown to their day — against his own national records and history. “Greek influence” was felt indeed, in India, in this, and only in this one particular. Greek damsels mentioned as an article of great traffic for India — Persian and Greek *Yāvanis* — were the fore-mothers of the modern *nautch-girls*, who had till then remained pure virgins of the inner temples. Alliances with the Antiochuses and the Seleucus Nicators bore no better fruit than the rotten apple of Sodom. Pātaliputra as prophesied by Gautama Buddha found its fate in the waters of the Ganges, having been twice before nearly destroyed, again like Sodom, by the fire of heaven.

Reverting to the main subject, the “contradictions” between the Ceylonese and Chino-Tibetan chronologies actually prove nothing. If the Chinese Annals of Sui in accepting the prophecy of our Lord that “a thousand years after he had reached Nirvana, his doctrines would reach the north” fall into the mistake of applying it to China, whereas Tibet was meant, the error was corrected after the XIth century of the Tzin Era in most of the temple chronologies. Besides which, it may now refer to other events relating to Buddhism of which Europe knows nothing, China or *Tzina* dates its present name only from the year 296 of the Buddhist era¹ (vulgar chronology having assumed it from the first *Huang* of the Tzin dynasty): therefore the Tathāgata could not have indicated it by this name in his well-known prophecy. If misunderstood even by several of the Buddhist commentators, it is yet preserved in its true sense by his own immediate Arhats. The Glorified One meant the country that stretches far off from the Lake Mānasa-sarovara; far beyond that region of the Himavat, where dwelt from time immemorial the great “teachers of the Snowy Range.” These were the great Srāman Āchāryas who preceded Him, and were His teachers, their humble successors trying to this day to perpetuate their and His doctrines. The prophecy came out true to the very day, and it is corroborated both by the mathematical and historical chronology of Tibet — quite as accurate as that of the Chinese. Arhat Kāśyapa, of the dynasty of Moryas, founded by one of the Chandraguptas near Pātaliputra, left the convent of Pāñch-Kukkutarama, in consequence of a vision of our Lord, for missionary purpose in the year 683 of the Tzin era (436 Western era)

¹ The reference to *Chinahunah* (Chinese and Huns) in the *Bhīshma Parva* of the *Mahabharata* is evidently a later interpolation, as it does not occur in the old MSS existing in Southern India.

and had reached the great Lake of Bod-Yul in the same year. It is at that period that expired the millennium prophesied. The Arhat carrying with him the 5th statue of Śākya Muni out of the seven gold statues made after his bodily death by order of the first Council, planted it in the soil on that very spot where seven years later was built the first GUNPA (monastery), where the earliest Buddhist lamas dwelt. And though the conversion of the whole country did not take place before the beginning of the 7th century (Western era), the good Law had, nevertheless, *reached* the North at the time prophesied, and no earlier. For, the first of the golden statues had been plundered from Bhikkhu Sali Sūka by the Hsiung-nu robbers and melted, during the days of Dhammāsōka, who had sent missionaries beyond Nepal. The *second* had a like fate, at Ghar-zha, even before it had reached the boundaries of Bod-Yul. The *third* was rescued from a barbarous tribe of Bōns by a Chinese military chief who had pursued them into the deserts of Shamo about 423 Bud[distic] era (120 “B.C.”). The *fourth* was sunk in the 3rd century of the Christian era together with the ship that carried it from Magadha toward the hills of Ghangs-chhèn-dzongá (Chittagong). The *fifth* arriving in the nick of time reached its destination with Arhat Kāśyapa. So did the last two.¹ . . .

On the other hand, the Southern Buddhists, headed by the Ceylonese, open their annals with the following event:

They claim *according to their native chronology* that *Vijaya*, the son of Sinhabahu, the Sovereign of Lala, a small kingdom or *Raj* on the Gandak river in Magadha, was ex-

¹ No doubt since the history of these seven statues is not in the hands of the Orientalists, it will be treated as a “groundless fable.” Nevertheless such is their origin and history. They date from the 1st Synod, that of Rājagriha, held in the season of *war* following the death of Buddha, *i.e.*, one year after his death. Were this Rājagriha Council held 100 years after, as maintained by some, it could not have been presided over by Mahākasyapa, the friend and brother Arhat of Sākyamuni, as he would have been 200 years old. The 2nd Council or Synod, that of Vaisali, was held 120 not 100 or 110 years as some would have it, after the *nirvana*, for the latter took place at a time, a little over 20 years before the physical death of Tathāgata. It was held at the great Saptaparna cave (*Mahavansa’s Sattapanni*), near the Mount Baibhār (the Webhāra of the Pāli Manuscripts), that was in Rājagriha, the old capital of Magadha. Memoirs exist, containing the record of his daily life, made by the nephew of king Ajātasatru, a favourite Bhikshu of the Mahachārya. These texts have ever been in the possession of the superiors of the first Lamasery built by Arhat Kāśyapa in Bod-Yul, most of whose Chohans were the descendants of the dynasty of the Moryas, there being up to this day three of the members of this once royal family living in India. The old text in question is a document written in *Anudruta* Magadha characters. [We deny that these or any other characters — whether Devanagari, Pali, or Dravidian — ever used in India, are variations of, or derived from, the Phœnician.] To revert to the texts it is therein stated that the Sattapanni cave, then called “Sarasvatī” and “Bamboo-cave,” got its latter name in this wise. When our Lord first sat in it for *Dhyāna*, it was a large six-chambered natural cave, 50 to 60 feet wide by 33 deep. One day, while teaching the mendicants outside, our Lord compared man to a *Saptaparna* (seven-leaved) plant, showing them how after the loss of its first leaf every other could be easily detached, but the seventh leaf — directly connected with the stem. “Mendicants,” He said, “there are seven Buddhas in every Buddha, and there are *six* Bhikshus and but one Buddha in each mendicant. What are the *Seven*? The seven branches of complete knowledge. What are the *six*? The six organs of sense. What are the *Five*? The five elements of illusive being. And the *ONE* which is also ten? He is a true Buddha who develops in him the ten forms of holiness and subjects them all to the one — the silent voice” (meaning Avalokiteśvara). After that, causing the rock to be moved at His command the Tathāgata made it divide itself into a seventh additional chamber, remarking that a rock too was septenary, and had seven stages of development. From that time it was called the *Sattapanni* or the Saptaparna cave. After the first Synod was held seven gold statues of the Bhagavan were cast by order of the king, and each of them was placed in one of the seven compartments. These in after times, when the good law had to make room to more congenial because more sensual creeds, were taken in charge by various vihāras and then disposed of as explained. Thus when Mr. Turnour states on the authority of the sacred traditions of Southern Buddhists that the cave received its name from the Sattapanni plant, he states what is correct. In the *Archæological Survey of India*, we find that Genl. Cunningham identifies with this cave one not far away from it and in the same Baibhar range, but which is most decidedly not our Saptaparna cave. At the same time the Chief Engineer of Buddha Gaya, Mr. Beglar, describing the *Cheta* cave, mentioned by Fa-Hien, thinks it is the Saptaparna cave — and he is right. For that as well as the Pippal and the other caves, mentioned in our texts, are too sacred in their associations — both having been used for centuries by generations of Bhikkhus, unto the very time of their leaving India — to have their sites so easily forgotten.

iled by his father for acts of turbulence and immorality. Sent adrift on the ocean with his companions after having had their heads shaved, Buddhist-Bhikkhu fashion, as a sign of penitence — he was carried to the shores of Lanka. Once landed, he and his companions conquered and easily took possession of an island inhabited by uncivilized tribes generically called the Yakshas. This — at whatever epoch and year it may have happened — is an *historical* fact, and the Ceylonese records independent of Buddhist chronology, give it out as having taken place 382 years before Dushtagamani (*i.e.*, in 543 before the Christian era). Now, the Buddhist Sacred Annals record certain words of our Lord pronounced by him shortly before his death. In *Mahāvansa*¹ He is made to have addressed them to Śakra, in the midst of a great assembly of Devatās (Dhyāni Chohans), and while already “in the exalted unchangeable Nirvāna, seated on the throne on which Nirvāna is achieved.” In our texts Tathāgata addresses them to his assembled Arhats and Bhikkhu a few days before his final liberation:

One Vijaya, the son of Sinhabahu, King of the land of Lala, together with 700 attendants, has just landed on Lanka. Lord of Dhyāni Buddhas (Devas)! My doctrine will be established on Lanka. Protect him and Lanka!

This is the sentence pronounced which, as proved later, was a prophecy. The now familiar phenomenon of clairvoyant prevision, amply furnishing a natural explanation of the prophetic utterance without any unscientific theory of miracle, the laugh of certain Orientalists seems uncalled for. Such parallels of poetico-religious embellishments as found in *Mahāvansa* exist in the written records of every religion — as much in Christianity as anywhere else. An unbiased mind would first endeavour to reach the correct and very superficially hidden meaning before throwing ridicule and contemptuous discredit upon them. Moreover, the Tibetans possess a more sober record of this prophecy in the *Notes*, already alluded to, reverentially taken down by King Ajātasatru's nephew. They are, as said above, in the possession of the Lamas of the convent built by Arhat Kāśyapa — the Moryas and their descendants being of a more direct descent than the Rajput Gautamas, the Chiefs of Nagara — the village identified with Kapilavastu — are the best entitled of all to their possession. And we know they are historical to a word. For the Esoteric Buddhist they yet vibrate in space; and these prophetic words together with the true picture of the Sugata who pronounced them, are present in the aura of every atom of His relics. This, we hasten to say, is no proof but for the psychologist. But there is other and historical evidence: the cumulative testimony of our religious chronicles. The philologist has not seen these; but this is no proof of their non-existence.

The mistake of the Southern Buddhists lies in dating the *Nirvana* of Sanggyas Panchen from the actual day of his death, whereas, as above stated, He had reached it over twenty years previous to His disincarnation. Chronologically, the Southerners are right, both in dating His death in 543 “B.C.,” and one of the great Councils at 100 years after the latter event. But the Tibetan Chohans who possess all the documents relating to the last 24 years of His *external* and *internal* life — of which no philologist knows anything — can show that there is no real discrepancy between the Tibetan

¹ [viii, 1-4]

and the Ceylonese chronologies as stated by the Western Orientalists.¹ For the profane, the Exalted One was born in the 68th year of the Burmese *Eeatzana* era, established by Eeatzana (Anjana) King of Dewadaha; for the *initiated* — in the 48th year of that era, on a Friday of the waxing moon, of May. And, it was in 563 before the Christian chronology that Tathāgata reached his full Nirvāna, dying, as correctly stated by *Mahāvansa* — in 543, on the very day when Vijaya landed with his companions in Ceylon — as prophesied by Lokanātha, our Buddha.

Professor Max Müller seems to greatly scoff at this prophecy. In his chapter² upon Buddhism (the “false” religion), the eminent scholar speaks as though he resented such an *unprecedented* claim. “We are further asked to believe” — he writes — “that the Ceylonese historians placed the founder of the Vijayan dynasty of Ceylon in the year 543, in accordance with their sacred chronology”! (*i.e.*, Buddha’s prophecy), while “we [the philologists] are not told, however, *through what channel* the Ceylonese would have received their information as to the exact date of Buddha’s death.”³ Two points may be noticed in these sarcastic phrases:

The implication of a false prophecy by our Lord; and

A dishonest tampering with chronological records, reminding one of those of Eusebius, the famous Bishop of Cæsarea, who stands accused in History of “perverting every Egyptian chronological table for the sake of synchronisms.”

With reference to charge *one* he may be asked why our Sakyasinha’s prophecies should not be as much entitled to his respect, as those of his Saviour would be to ours — were we to ever write the true history of the “Galilean” Arhat. With regard to charge *two* the distinguished philologist is reminded of the glass house he and all Christian chronologists are themselves living in. Their inability to vindicate the adoption of December 25th as the actual day of the Nativity, and hence to determine the age and the year of their Avatar’s death even before their own people — is far greater than is ours to demonstrate the year of Buddha to other nations. Their utter failure to establish *on any other but traditional evidence* the, to them, historically *unproved*, if probable, fact of his existence at all — ought to engender a fairer spirit. When Christian historians can, upon undeniable *historical* authority, justify biblical and ecclesiastical chronology, then, perchance, they may be better equipped than at present for the congenial work of rending heathen chronologies into shreds.

The “channel” the Ceylonese received their information through, was two Bhikkhus who had left Magadha to follow their disgraced brethren into exile. The capacity of Siddhartha Buddha’s Arhats for transmitting intelligence by psychic currents may, perhaps, be conceded without any great stretch of imagination to have been equal to, if not greater than that of the prophet Elijah, who is credited with the power of having known from any distance all that happened in the king’s bed-chamber. No Orien-

¹ Bishop Bigandet, after examining all the Burmese authorities accessible to him, frankly confesses that “the history of Buddha offers an almost complete blank as to what regards his doings and preachings during a period of nearly twenty-three years. . . .” Vol. I, p. 260. — *Boris de Zirkoff*. [The reference is to Bigandet’s *The Life or Legend of Gaudama, the Budha of the Burmese*, Rangoon, 1866.]

² *Hist. A.S.L.*

³ [Annotation by Boris de Zirkoff: Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 267. Italics are H.P. Blavatsky’s.]

talist has the right to reject the testimony of other people's Scriptures, while professing belief in the far more contradictory and entangled evidence of his own, upon the self-same theory of proof. If Prof. Müller is a sceptic at heart, then let him fearlessly declare himself: only a sceptic who impartially acts the iconoclast, has the right to assume such a tone of contempt toward any non-Christian religion. And for the instruction of the impartial enquirer only, shall it be thought worthwhile to collate the evidence afforded by historical — not psychological — data. Meanwhile, by analysing some objections and exposing the dangerous logic of our critic, we may give the theosophists a few more facts connected with the subject under discussion.

Now that we have seen Prof. Max Müller's opinions in general about this, so to say, the Prologue to the Buddhist *Drama* with Vijaya as the hero — what has he to say as to the details of its plot? What weapon does he use to weaken this foundation stone of a chronology upon which are built, and on which depend all other Buddhist dates? What is the fulcrum for the critical lever he uses against the Asiatic records? Three of his main points may be stated *seriatim* with answers appended. He begins by premising that:

1 “ . . . if in this manner the starting point of the Northern Buddhist chronology turns out to be merely hypothetical, based as it is on a prophecy of Buddha, it will be difficult to avoid the same conclusion with regard to the date assigned to Buddha's death by the Buddhists of Ceylon and of Burmah . . . ”¹ “ . . . the *Mahāvansa* begins with relating three miraculous visits which Buddha, during his lifetime, paid to Ceylon.”² “*Vijaya*, the founder of the first dynasty [in Ceylon], means *Conquest*, and such a person most likely never existed.”³ This he believes invalidates the whole Buddhist chronology.

To which the following pendant may be offered:

William I, King of England, is commonly called the *Conqueror*; he was, moreover, the illegitimate son of Robert, Duke of Normandy, surnamed *le Diable*. An opera, we hear, was invented on this subject, and full of miraculous events, called “Robert the Devil,” showing its traditional character. Therefore shall we be also justified in saying that Edward the Confessor, Saxons and all, up to the time of the union of the houses of York and Lancaster under Henry VII — the new historical period in English history — are all “fabulous tradition” and “such a person as William the Conqueror *most likely never existed?*”

2 In the Chinese Chronology — continues the dissecting critic — “the list of the thirty-three Buddhist patriarchs . . . gives the date of their deaths from Chakiamouni, who died 950 B.C., to Hui-neng, who died 713 A.D., and bears, like everything Chinese, the character of the most exact chronological accuracy. The first link, however, in this long chain of patriarchs is of a doubtful character.” For Western History “if . . . the exact Ceylonese chronology begins with 161 B.C., it is but reasonable to

¹ p. 266

² p. 269

³ p. 268

suppose that there existed in Ceylon a traditional native chronology extending beyond that date . . .” “Therefore . . . what goes before . . . is but fabulous tradition.”¹

The chronology of the Apostles and their existence has never been proved historically. The history of the Papacy is confessedly “obscure.” Ennodius of Pavia (5th century) was the first one to address the Roman Bishop (Symmachus) — who comes fifty-first in the Apostolic succession, as “Pope.” Thus, if we were to write the History of Christianity, and indulge in remarks upon its chronology, we might say that since there were no antecedent Popes; and since the Apostolic line began with Symmachus (498 “A.D.”); all Christian records beginning with the Nativity and up to the sixth century are *therefore* — “fabulous traditions,” and all Christian chronology is “purely hypothetical.”

3 Two discrepant dates in Buddhist chronology are scornfully pointed out by the Oxford Professor. If the landing of Vijaya, in Lanka — he says — on the same day that Buddha reached Nirvāna (died) is in fulfilment of Buddha’s prophecy, then “if Buddha *was a true prophet*, the Ceylonese argue quite rightly that *he must have died in the year of the Conquest, or 543 B.C.*”² On the other hand the Chinese have a Buddhist chronology of their own; and — it does not agree with the Ceylonese. “. . . the lifetime of Buddha, from 1029 to 950, rests on his own prophecy, that a Millennium would elapse from his death to the conversion of China. If, therefore, Buddha *was a true prophet he must have lived about 1000 B.C.*”³ But the date does not agree with the Ceylonese chronology; *ergo* — Buddha *was a false prophet*. As to that other “the first and most important link” in the Ceylonese as well as in the Chinese chronology, “it is extremely weak . . .” In the Ceylonese “a *miraculous genealogy*,” *had to be provided for* Vijaya, and, “a prophecy was, *therefore, invented*”^{4, 5}

On these same lines of argument it may be argued that:

Since no genealogy of Jesus, “exact or inexact,” is found in any of the world’s records save those entitled — the Gospels of SS. Matthew,⁶ and Luke;⁷ and, since these radically disagree — although this personage is the most conspicuous in Western history, and the nicest accuracy might have been expected in his case; therefore, agreeably with Prof. Max Müller’s sarcastic logic, if Jesus “*was a true prophet, he must have descended from David through Joseph*”;⁸ and “if he was *a true prophet*” again, then the Christians “argue quite rightly that he must have” descended from David through Mary.⁹ Furthermore, since the two genealogies are obviously discrepant and prophe-

¹ [Annotation by Boris de Zirkoff: The first two quotations in this paragraph are from pp. 265-66, and 268 of Müller’s work. The third one could not be traced. There is, however, on page 266, the following passage: “Before that time then chronology is traditional, and full of absurdities.”]

² p. 270

³ p. 266

⁴ p. 269

⁵ [Annotation by Boris de Zirkoff: None of the italics in these quotations appear in the original text of Max Müller.]

⁶ i, 1-17

⁷ iii, 23-38

⁸ Matthew’s Gospel

⁹ Luke’s Gospel

cies were truly “invented” by the post-apostolic theologians [or, if preferred, old prophecies of Isaiah and other O.T. prophets, irrelevant to Jesus, were *adapted* to suit his case — as recent English commentators (in Holy Orders), the Bible revisers, now concede] and since moreover — always following the Professor’s argument, in the cases of Buddhist and Brāhmanical chronologies — “traditional and full of absurdities . . . every attempt to bring them into harmony having proved a failure,”¹ are Bible chronology and genealogies less so? Have we, or have we not a certain right to retort, that if Gautama Buddha is shown on these lines *a false prophet*, then Jesus must be likewise “a false prophet”? And if Jesus was a true prophet despite existing confusion of authorities, why on the same lines may not Buddha have been one? Discredit the Buddhist prophecies and the Christian ones must go along with them.

The utterances of the ancient pythoness now but provoke the scientific smile: but no tripod ever mounted by the prophetess of old was so shaky as the chronological trinity of points upon which this Orientalist stands to deliver his oracles. Moreover his arguments are double-edged, as shown. If the citadel of Buddhism can be undermined by Prof. Max Müller’s critical engineering, then *pari passu* that of Christianity must crumble in the same ruins. Or have the Christians alone the monopoly of *absurd* religious “inventions” and the right of being jealous of any infringement of their patent rights?

To conclude, we say, that the year of Buddha’s death is correctly stated by Mr. Sinnett, *Esoteric Buddhism* having to give its chronological dates according to *esoteric* reckoning. And this reckoning would alone, if explained, make away with every objection urged, from Prof. M. Müller’s *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* down to the latest “evidence” — *the proofs* in the *Reports of the Archæological Survey of India*. The Ceylonese era, as given in *Mahāvansa*, is correct in everything, withholding but the above given fact of Nirvana, the great mystery of *Samma-Sambuddha* and *Abhijñā* remaining to this day unknown to the outsider; and though certainly known to Bhikkhu Mahānāma — King Dhātusena’s uncle — it could not be explained in a work like the *Mahāvansa*. Moreover the Singhalese chronology agrees in every particular with the Burmese chronology. Independent of the religious era dating from Buddha’s death, called “*Nirvānic Era*,” there existed, as now shown by Bishop Bigandet,² two historical eras. One lasted 1362 years its last year corresponding with 1156 of the Christian era: the other, broken in two small eras, the last succeeding immediately the other, exists to the present day. The beginning of the first, which lasted 562 years, coincides with the year 79 A.D. and the Indian Sāka era. Consequently the learned Bishop, who surely can never be suspected of partiality to Buddhism, accepts the year 543 of Buddha’s Nirvana. So do Mr. Turnour, Professor Lassen, and others.

The alleged discrepancies between the 14 various dates of Nirvana collected by Csoma de Körös, do not relate to the *Nyr-Nyang* in the least. They are calculations concerning the Nirvana of the precursors, the Bodhisattwas and previous incarnations of Sanggyas, that the Hungarian found in various works and wrongly applied to the last

¹ p. 266

² *Life of Gaudama*, etc.

Buddha. Europeans must not forget that this enthusiast acted under protest of the Lamas during the time of his stay with them; and that, moreover, he had learned more about the doctrines of the heretical Duggpas than of the orthodox Geluggpas. The statement of this “great *authority* [!] on Tibetan Buddhism,” as he is called, to the effect that Gautama had *three* wives whom he names — and then contradicts himself by showing¹ that the first two wives “are one and the same,” shows how little he can be regarded as an “authority.” He had not even learned that “Gopa, Yasodhara and Utpala Varna,” are the three names for three mystical powers. So with the “discrepancies” of the dates. Out of the 64 mentioned by him but two relate to Śākya Muni: namely, the years 576 and 546 — and these two err in their transcription; for when corrected they must stand 564 and 543. As for the rest they concern the seven *ku-sum*, or triple form of the Nirvānic state and their respective duration, and relate to doctrines of which Orientalists know absolutely nothing.

Consequently from the Northern Buddhists, who, as confessed by Professor Weber, “alone possess these (Buddhist) Scriptures *complete*,” and have “preserved more authentic information regarding the circumstances of their redaction” — the Orientalists have up to this time learned next to nothing. The Tibetans say that Tathāgata became a full Buddha, *i.e.*, reached *absolute* Nirvana in 2544 of the Kali era (according to Sauramanam), and thus *lived* indeed but *eighty* years, as no *Nirvāni* of the *seventh degree* can be reckoned among the *living* (*i.e.*, existing) men. It is no better than loose conjecture to argue that it would have entered as little into the thoughts of the Brahmans of noting the day of Buddha’s birth “as the Romans, or even the Jews, [would have] thought of preserving the date of the birth of Jesus before he had become the founder of a religion.”² For, while the Jews had been from the first rejecting the claim of Messiahship set up by the Chelas of the Jewish prophet, and were not expecting their Messiah at that time, the Brahmans (the initiates, at any rate) knew of the coming of him whom they regarded as an incarnation of divine wisdom and therefore were well aware of the astrological date of his birth. If, in after times in their impotent rage, they destroyed every accessible vestige of the birth, life and death of Him, who in his boundless mercy to all creatures had revealed their carefully concealed mysteries and doctrines in order to check the ecclesiastical torrent of ever-growing superstitions, there had been a time when he was met by them as an Avatar. And, *though they destroyed, others preserved*.

The thousand and one speculations and the torturing of exoteric texts by Archæologist or Palæographer will ill repay the time lost in their study.

The Indian Annals specify King Ajatasatru as a contemporary of Buddha, and another Ajatasatru helped to prepare the council 100 years after his death. These princes were sovereigns of Magadha and have naught to do with Ajatasatru of the *Brihad-Āranyaka* and the *Kaushitaki-Upanishad*, who was a sovereign of the Kasis; though Bhadrasena, “the son of Ajatasatru” cursed by Aruni — may have more to do with his namesake the “heir of Chandragupta” than is generally known. Professor Max Müller objects to two Asokas. He rejects Kalasoka and accepts but Dharmasoka — in

¹ *Grammar of the Tibetan Language*, p. 162, note

² M. Müller’s *Hist. A.S.L.*, p. 263

accordance with “Greek” and in utter conflict with Buddhist chronology. He knows not or perchance prefers ignoring — that besides the two Asokas there were several personages named Chandragupta and Chandramasa. Plutarch is set aside as conflicting with the more welcome theory, and the evidence of Justin alone is accepted. There was Kalasoka, called by some Chandramasa and by others Chandragupta, whose son Nanda was succeeded by his cousin the Chandragupta of Seleucus, and under whom the Council of Vaisali took place “supported by King Nanda” as correctly stated by Taranatha. [None of them were Sudras, and this is a pure invention of the Brahmans.] Then there was the last of the Chandraguptas who assumed the name of *Vikrama*; he commenced the new era called the Vikramaditya or Samvat and began the new dynasty at Pātaliputra, 318 B.C. — according to some European “authorities”; after him his son Bindusara or Bhadrāsena — also Chandragupta, who was followed by Dharmasoka Chandragupta. And there were two Piyadasis — the “Sandracottos” Chandragupta and Asoka. And if controverted — the Orientalists will have to account for this strange inconsistency. If Asoka was the only “Piyadasi” and the builder of the monuments, and maker of the rock-inscriptions of this name; and if his inauguration occurred as conjectured by Professor Max Müller about 259 B.C., in other words, if he reigned 60 or 70 years later than any of the Greek kings named on the Piyadasian monuments, what had he to do with their vassalage or non-vassalage, or how was he concerned with them at all? Their dealings had been with his grandfather some 70 years earlier — if he became a Buddhist only after ten years’ occupancy of the throne. And finally three well-known Bhadrāsenas can be proved, whose names spelt loosely and phonetically, according to each writer’s dialect and nationality, now yield a variety of names, from Bindusara, Bimbisara, and Vindusara; down to Bhadrāsena and Bhadrāsara, as he is called in the *Vāyu-Purāna*. These are all synonymous. However easy, at first sight, it may seem to be to brush out of history a real personage, it becomes more difficult to prove the non-existence of Kalasoka by calling him “false,” while the second Asoka is termed “the real,” in the face of the evidence of the *Purānas*, written by the bitterest enemies of the Buddhists, the Brahmans of the period. The *Vāyu-* and *Matsya-Purāna* mention both in their lists of the reigning Sovereigns of the Nanda and the Morya dynasties. And, though they connect Chandragupta with a *Sudra* Nanda, they do not deny existence to Kalasoka — for the sake of invalidating Buddhist chronology. However falsified the now extant texts of both the *Vāyu* and *Matsya Purānas*, even accepted as they at present stand “in their true meaning,” which Prof. Max Müller (notwithstanding his confidence) fails to seize, they are *not* “at variance with Buddhist chronology before Chandragupta.” Not, at any rate, when the *real* Chandragupta instead of the false Sandracottos of the Greeks is introduced and authenticated. Quite independently of the Buddhist version, there exists the historical fact recorded in the Brāhmanical as well as in the Burmese and Tibetan versions, that in the year 63 of Buddha, Śīśunāga of Benares was chosen king by the people of Pātaliputra, who made away with Ajatasatru’s dynasty. Śīśunāga removed the capital of Magadha from Rājagriha to Vaisali, while his successor Kalasoka removed it in his turn to Pātaliputra. It was during the reign of

the latter that the prophecy of Buddha concerning Pātalibat or Pātaliputra — a small village during His time — was realized.¹

It will be easy enough, when the time comes, to answer all-denying Orientalists and face them with proof and document in hand. They speak of the extravagant, wild exaggerations of the Buddhists and Brahmans. The latter answer: “The wildest theorists of all are they who, to evade a self-evident fact, assume moral, anti-national impossibilities, entirely opposed to the most conspicuous traits of the Brāhmanical Indian character — namely, borrowing from, or imitating in anything, other nations. From their comments on *Rig Veda*, down to the annals of Ceylon, from Pānini to Matouan-lin, every page of their learned scholia appears, to one acquainted with the subject, like a monstrous jumble of unwarranted, and insane speculations.” Therefore, notwithstanding Greek chronology and Chandragupta — whose date is represented as “the sheet-anchor of Indian chronology” that “nothing will ever shake” — it is to be feared that as regards India, the chronological ship of the Sanskritists has already broken from her moorings and gone adrift with all her precious freight of conjectures and hypotheses. She is drifting into danger. We are at the end of a cycle — geological and other — and at the beginning of another. Cataclysm is to follow cataclysm. The pent-up forces are bursting out in many quarters; and not only will men be swallowed up or slain by thousands, “new” land appear and “old” subside, volcanic eruptions and tidal waves appal; but secrets of an unsuspected Past will be uncovered to the dismay of Western theorists, and the humiliation of an imperious science. This drifting ship, if watched, may be seen to ground upon the upheaved vestiges of ancient civilizations, and fall to pieces. We are not emulous of the prophet’s honours: but still, let this stand as a prophecy.²



¹ See *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*

² *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (ENQUIRIES SUGGESTED BY SINNETT’S “ESOTERIC BUDDHISM”) V pp. 241-59

Part 2. By Tallapragada Subba Row

Responding to a question from F.W.H. Myers, English F.T.S., arising from A.P. Sinnett's "Esoteric Buddhism."¹

From *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (ENQUIRIES SUGGESTED BY SINNETT'S "ESOTERIC BUDDHISM") Vol. V, Question VII: Philological and Archæological "Difficulties" — Inscriptions discovered by General A. Cunningham; pp. 259-62.

We have carefully examined the new inscription discovered by General A. Cunningham on the strength of which the date assigned to Buddha's death by Buddhist writers has been declared to be incorrect; and we are of opinion that the said inscription confirms the truth of the Buddhist traditions instead of proving them to be erroneous. The above mentioned archæologist writes as follows regarding the inscription under consideration in the first volume of his reports:

. . . the most interesting [inscription at Gaya] is a long and perfect one, dated in the era of the *Nirvāna*, or death of Buddha. I read the date as follows:

Bhagavati parinirvritte samvat 1819 Karttike badi 1 Budhe, that is, "in the year 1819 of the emancipation of Bhagavata, on Wednesday, the first day of the waning moon of Kartik." If the era here used is the same as that of the Buddhists of Ceylon and Burmah, which began in 543 B.C., the date of this inscription will be $1819 - 543 = \text{A.D. } 1276$. The style of the letters is in keeping with this date, but is quite incompatible with that derivable from the Chinese date of the era. The Chinese place the death of Buddha upwards of 1000 years before Christ, so that, according to them, the date of this inscription would be about A.D. 800, a period much too early for the style of character used in the inscription. But as the day of the week is here fortunately added, the date can be verified by calculation. According to my calculation the date of the inscription corresponds with Wednesday, the 17th September, A.D. 1342. This would place the *Nirvāna* of Buddha in 477 B.C., which is the very year that was first proposed by myself as the most probable date of that event. This corrected date has since been adopted by Professor Max Müller.²

¹ [Refer to "Related titles for deeper study," on page 17 of this study. — ED. PHIL.]

² *Annotation by Boris de Zirkoff*: This quotation is from the work entitled *Archæological Survey of India*. Four Reports made during the years 1862-63-64-65, by Alexander Cunningham, C.S.I., Simla, 1871, Vol. I, p. 1. At the end of the quotation immediately following the name of Max Müller, a footnote is appended, which reads:

"I have since submitted this date to the scrutiny of my learned friend Bāpu Deva Sāstri, the well-known astronomer; according to whose calculation the 1st of *Kartik badi* in A.D. 1276 was a Friday, and in A.D. 1342 a Monday; but in A.D. 1341 it fell on Wednesday the 7th of October N.S., which would place the beginning of the Buddhist era in B.C. 478."

The reasons assigned by some Orientalists for considering this so-called “corrected date” as the real date of Buddha’s death have already been noticed and criticized in the preceding article; and now we have only to consider whether the inscription in question disproves the old date.

Major-General Cunningham evidently seems to take it for granted, as far as his present calculation is concerned, that the number of days in a year is counted in the Magadha country and by Buddhist writers in general on the same basis on which the number of days in a current English year is counted; and this wrong assumption has vitiated his calculation and led him to a wrong conclusion. Three different methods of calculation were in use in India at the time when Buddha lived, and they are still in use in different parts of the country. These methods are known as *Sauramanam*, *Chandramanam* and *Barhaspatyamanam*. According to the Hindu works on Astronomy a Sauramanam year consists of 365 days, 15 ghadias and 31 vighadias; a Chandramanam year has 360 days, and a year on the basis of Barhaspatyamanam has 361 days and 11 ghadias nearly. Such being the case, General Cunningham ought to have taken the trouble of ascertaining before he made his calculation the particular *Manam* employed by the writers of Magadha and Ceylon in giving the date of Buddha’s death and the *Manam* used in calculating the years of the *Buddhist era* mentioned in the inscription above quoted. Instead of placing himself in the position of the writer of the said inscription and making the required calculation from that standpoint, he made the calculation on the same basis on which an English gentleman of the 19th century would calculate time according to his own calendar.

If the calculation were correctly made, it would have shown him that the inscription in question is perfectly consistent with the statement that Buddha died in the year 543 B. C. according to Barhaspatyamanam (the only *manam* used in Magadha and by Pali writers in general). The correctness of this assertion will be clearly seen on examining the following calculation.

543 years according to Barhaspatyamanam are equivalent to 536 years and 8 months (nearly) according to Sauramanam.

Similarly 1819 years according to the former *manam* are equivalent to 1798 years nearly according to the latter *manam*.

As the Christian era commenced on the 3102nd year of Kaliyuga (according to Sauramanam) Buddha died in the year 2565 of Kaliyuga and the inscription was written in the year 4362 of Kaliyuga (according to Sauramanam). And now the question is whether according to the *Hindu Almanac*, the first day of the waning moon of Kārttika coincided with a Wednesday.

According to *Sūrya-Siddhānta* the number of days from the beginning of Kaliyuga up to midnight on the 15th day of increasing moon of Aswina is 1,593,072, the number of Adhikamasas (extra months) during the interval being 1608 and the number of Kshayatthis 25,323.

If we divide this number by 7 the remainder would be 5. As Kaliyuga commenced with Friday, the period of time above defined closed with Tuesday, as according to *Sūrya-Siddhānta* a week-day is counted from midnight to midnight.

It is to be noticed that in places where Barhaspatyamanam is in use Krishna-paksham (or the dark half) commences first and is followed by Suklapaksham.

Consequently the next day after the 15th day of the waxing moon of Aswina will be the 1st day of the waning moon of Kārttika to those who are guided by the Barhaspatyamanam calendar. And therefore the latter date, which is the date mentioned in the inscription, was Wednesday in the year 4362 of Kaliyuga.

The geocentric longitude of the sun at the time of his meridian passage on the said date being 174° 20' 16" and the moon's longitude being 7° 51' 42" (according to *Sūrya-Siddhānta*) it can be easily seen that at Gaya there was Padyamitithi (1st day of waning moon) for nearly 7 ghadias and 50 vighadias from the time of sunrise.

It is clear from the foregoing calculation that "Karttik 1 badi" coincided with Wednesday in the year 4362 of Kaliyuga or the year 1261 of the Christian era, and that from the standpoint of the person who wrote the inscription the said year was the 1819th year of the Buddhist era. And consequently this new inscription confirms the correctness of the date assigned to Buddha's death by Buddhist writers. It would have been better if Major General Cunningham had carefully examined the basis of his calculation before proclaiming to the world at large that the Buddhist accounts were untrustworthy.



Related titles for deeper study.

Being Madame Blavatsky's replies to questions by an English F.T.S., arising from A.P. Sinnett's "Esoteric Buddhism," excerpted from "H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings," Vol. V, and edited by Philaletheians UK.

- ① DO THE ADEPTS DENY THE NEBULAR THEORY? (BCW, pp. 150-55)
— by H.P. Blavatsky, in our *Planetary Rounds and Globes Series*, under the title "The master key to all imponderables of the nebular theory."
- ② IS THE SUN MERELY A COOLING MASS? (BCW, pp. 155-63)
— by H.P. Blavatsky, in our *Planetary Rounds and Globes Series*.
- ③ ARE THE GREAT NATIONS TO BE SWEEPED AWAY IN AN HOUR? (BCW, pp. 163-71)
— by H.P. Blavatsky, in our *Atlantean Realities Series*, under the title "Like the Phoenix of lore, Arts and Sciences die only to revive."
- ④ IS THE MOON IMMERSSED IN MATTER?¹ (BCW, p. 171)
- ⑤ ABOUT THE MINERAL MONAD (BCW, pp. 171-75)
— by H.P. Blavatsky, in our *Secret Doctrine's Third Proposition Series*, under the title "Blavatsky on the Force of the Mineral Monas."
- ⑥ SRI SANKARACHARYA'S DATE AND DOCTRINE (BCW, pp. 176-97)
— by T. Subba Row, in our *Buddhas and Initiates Series*, under the title "Shankara was a contemporary of Patañjali and his chela."
- ⑦ "HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY" — WHY? (BCW, pp. 198-210)
Including LEAFLETS FROM ESOTERIC HISTORY (BCW, pp. 211-26)
— by H.P. Blavatsky, in our *Atlantean Realities Series*, under the title "Antiquity of the Atlanto-Aryan tribes in Europe."
- ⑧ PHILOLOGICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL "DIFFICULTIES" (BCW, pp. 227-41)
— by H.P. Blavatsky and Edward Pococke, in our *Hellenic and Hellenistic Papers Series*, under the title "India is the Mother of Greece."
- ⑨ SAKYA MUNI'S PLACE IN HISTORY (BCW, pp. 241-59)
— by H.P. Blavatsky, in our *Buddhas and Initiates Series*, under the title "Date of Gautama Buddha's disincarnation."
- ⑩ INSCRIPTIONS DISCOVERED BY GENERAL A. CUNNINGHAM (BCW, pp. 259-62)
— by T. Subba Row, in our *Buddhas and Initiates Series*, under the title "Date of Gautama Buddha's disincarnation."
- ⑩ BLAVATSKY REBUKES A SHAM THEOSOPHIST AND BIGOTED ASS! (BCW, pp. 329-34) — in our *Blavatsky Speaks Series*.

¹ [Comment from *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, V p. 171:

No "Adept," so far as the writers know, has ever given to "Lay Chela" his "views of the moon," for publication. With Selenography, modern science is far better acquainted than any humble Asiatic ascetic may ever hope to become. It is to be feared the speculations on pp. 104 & 105 of *Esoteric Buddhism*, besides being hazy, are somewhat premature. . . . — H.P. Blavatsky.]

Suggested reading for students.



- ALL AVATĀRAS ARE IDENTICAL, WORLD-SAVIOURS GROWN OUT FROM A SINGLE SEED
- ARNOLD NOT AN INITIATE
- ARNOLD'S LIGHT OF ASIA
- AURA OF THE YOGI IN TRANCE
- BLAVATSKY ON APOLLONIUS OF TYANA
- BLAVATSKY ON COUNT ALESSANDRO DI CAGLIOSTRO
- BLAVATSKY ON DIVINE REINCARNATIONS IN TIBET
- BLAVATSKY ON SCHOPENHAUER
- BLAVATSKY ON THE COUNT DE SAINT-GERMAIN
- BLAVATSKY ON THE TRANS-HIMALAYAN FRATERNITY
- BLAVATSKY ON THE TRIALS AND TRIUMPH OF INITIATION
- BLAVATSKY PAYS TRIBUTE TO ÉLIPHAS LEVI
- BUDDHISM IN ACTION IS UNCONDITIONAL COMPASSION, WISE AND MERCIFUL
- BUDDHISM, THE RELIGION OF PRE-VEDIC INDIA
- BURNET AND BLAVATSKY ON ANAXAGORAS' IDEAS AND IMPACT
- CHANT FOR THE NEOPHYTES AFTER THEIR LAST INITIATION
- DRAWING 1 - FORCES AND STATES OF CONSCIOUSNESS
- DRAWING 2 - CHRIST OR HIGHER MANAS CRUCIFIED BETWEEN TWO THIEVES
- DRAWING 3 - NEOPHYTE ON TRIAL DYING IN THE CHRĒST CONDITION
- DRAWING 4 - NEOPHYTE ASCENDING TO THE CHRIST CONDITION
- DRAWING 5 - THE SECRET HEART SEAL
- DUTIES OF A DHYĀNI CHOCHAN
- EMERSON ON PLUTARCH'S MORALS
- EMPEDOCLES, PAGAN THAUMATURGIST

BUDDHAS AND INITIATES SERIES
SUGGESTED READING FOR STUDENTS

- ESOTERIC VERSUS TANTRIC TATTVAS (TABLE)
- EVERY INITIATE MUST BE AN ADEPT IN OCCULTISM
- G.R.S. MEAD'S ESSAY ON SIMON MAGUS
- GAUTAMA AND JESUS PARALLEL LIVES
- GAUTAMA BUDDHA BEATIFIED!
- GAUTAMA IS THE FIFTH TEACHER IN THE CURRENT PLANETARY ROUND
- HINTS ABOUT THE TRIADIC HYPOSTASIS OF BUDDHA
- HUMILITY IS NO VIRTUE
- IAMBLICHUS ON PYTHAGORAS
- IAMBLICHUS ON THEURGY (1915)
- JESUS BEN PANDIRA, THE HISTORICAL CHRIST
- JUDGE ON THE DWELLERS ON HIGH MOUNTAINS
- JULIAN AND SOCRATES WERE PUT TO DEATH FOR THE SAME CRIME
- KALI-YUGA AND THE KALKI-AVATĀRA
- LOHANS ARE THE MELLIFLUOUS DISCIPLES OF TATHĀGATA
- MAGIC OR THEURGY, PURPOSE AND PITFALLS
- MORALITY IS MAN'S PRISTINE EFFORT TO HARMONISE WITH UNIVERSAL LAW
- OCCULT METAPHYSICS UNRIDDED FROM MATERIALISTIC MISCONCEPTIONS
- OVID ON PYTHAGORAS' TEACHINGS AND ETHICS
- PARACELSUS BY FRANZ HARTMANN
- PARACELSUS ON SYMPATHETIC REMEDIES AND CURES
- PAUL AN INITIATE AND FOUNDER OF CHRISTIANITY
- PETER NOT AN INITIATE AND THE ENEMY OF PAUL
- PHERECYDES, AN EARLY WESTERN PHILOSOPHER
- PLUTARCH ON PHOCION CHRĒSTOS
- PLUTARCH ON THE TUTELARY DAIMŌN OF SOCRATES
- PORPHYRY ON PYTHAGORAS
- PRINCIPLES AND FORCES IN NATURE AND MAN (DIAGRAM)
- PRINCIPLES AND FORCES IN NATURE AND MAN (INSTRUCTIONS)
- PROCLUS ON SOCRATES' DAEMON (TAYLOR)
- SAMSON AND HERCULES ARE PERSONIFICATIONS OF NEOPHYTES
- SHANKARA WAS A CONTEMPORARY OF PATAÑJALI AND HIS CHELA
- THE ADEPTS DESTROY THE WICKED AND GUARD THE PATH OF THE VIRTUOUS

**BUDDHAS AND INITIATES SERIES
SUGGESTED READING FOR STUDENTS**

- THE HOLY RITES OF ELEUSIS WERE ARCHAIC WISDOM RELIGION
- THE INITIATE'S CROWN OF THORNS
- THE KEY TO THE MYSTERY OF BUDDHA LIES IN THE CLEAR APPERCEPTION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN
- THE LITTLE ONES ARE ABOVE THE LAW
- THE NOBLE GENIUS OF PARACELSUS
- THE REAL CHRIST IS BUDDHI-MANAS, THE GLORIFIED DIVINE EGO
- THE ROLE OF ADEPTS IN THE GREAT AMERICAN REVOLUTION
- THE TRIPLE MYSTERY OF BUDDHA'S EMBODIMENT
- THEOPHANIA AND OPTIONS OPEN TO THE ADEPT
- THEOSOPHICAL JEWELS – THE AURA OF SUGATA
- THEOSOPHICAL JEWELS – THE LOVE OF GODS
- THOMAS TAYLOR, THE ENGLISH PLATONIST
- WHY THE SECRECY OF INITIATES?
- ZANONI BY BULWER-LYTTON

