

# THEOSOPHICAL HISTORY

---

July 1990  
\$3.00



A Quarterly Journal of Research  
ISSN 0951497X

# Theosophical History

## A Quarterly Journal of Research

Founded by Leslie Price, 1985

Volume 3, No. 3, July 1990

### Editor

James A. Santucci  
California State University, Fullerton

### Associate Editors

John Cooper  
University of Sydney

Robert Ellwood  
University of Southern California

J. Gordon Melton  
Institute for the Study of American Religion,  
University of California, Santa Barbara

Joscelyn Godwin  
Colgate University

Gregory Tillett  
Macquarie University

THEOSOPHICAL HISTORY (ISSN 0951497X) is published quarterly in January, April, July and October by the Theosophical History Foundation. The journal's purpose is to publish contributions specifically related to the modern Theosophical Movement, from the time of Madame Helena Blavatsky and others responsible in establishing the original Theosophical Society (1875), to all groups that derive their teachings directly or indirectly, knowingly and unknowingly from her, or her immediate followers. In addition, the journal is also receptive to related movements (including pre-Blavatskyite Theosophy, Spiritualism, Rosicrucianism, and the philosophy of Emanuel Swedenborg to give but a few examples) that have had the influence on or displayed an affinity to modern Theosophy.

The subscription fee for the journal is \$12.00 (U.S.) a year. Single issues are \$3.00. The airmail rate for subscribers outside the U.S. is \$24.00 a year. Please make checks or money payable in U.S. funds to the Theosophical History Foundation. Subscriptions should be sent to *James Santucci, Department of Religious Studies, California State University, Fullerton. CA 92634-9480 (U.S.A.)*.

The Editors assume no responsibility for the views expressed by authors in *Theosophical History*.

The Theosophical History Foundation is a non profit public benefit corporation, located at the Department of Religious Studies, California State University, Fullerton, 1800 North State College Boulevard, Fullerton, CA (USA) 92634-9480 (U.S.A.). Its purpose is to publish Theosophical History and to facilitate the study and dissemination of information regarding the Theosophical

Movement. The Foundation's Board of Directors consists of the following members: April Hejka-Ekins, Jerry Hejka-Ekins, J. Gordon Melton, and James A. Santucci.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Editors assume no responsibility for the views expressed by authors in *Theosophical History*.

The Theosophical History Foundation is a non-profit public benefit corporation, located at the Department of Religious Studies, California State University, Fullerton, 1800 North State College Boulevard, Fullerton, CA (USA) 92634-9480 (U.S.A.). Its purpose is to publish Theosophical History and to facilitate the study and dissemination of information regarding the Theosophical Movement. The Foundation's Board of Directors consists of the following members: April Hejka-Ekins, Jerry Hejka-Ekins, J. Gordon Melton, and James A. Santucci.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Guidelines for Submission of Manuscripts.** The final copy of all manuscripts must be submitted on 8 1/2 x 11 inch paper, double-spaced, and with margins of least 1 1/4 inches on all sides. Words and phrases intended for *italic* should be underlined in the manuscript. The submitter is also encouraged to submit a floppy disk of the work in ASCII or WordPerfect 5 in an I.B.M. or compatible format. We ask, however, that details of the format codes be included so that we do not have difficulties in using the disk. Should there be any undue difficulty in fulfilling the above, we encourage you to submit the manuscript regardless.

Bibliographical entries and citations must be placed in footnote format. The citations must be complete. For books, the publisher's name and the place and date of publication are required; for journal articles, the volume, number and date must be included, should the information be available.

There is no limitation on the length of manuscripts. In general, articles of 20 pages or less will be published in full; articles in excess of 20 pages may be published serially.

Brief communications, review articles and book reviews are welcome. They should be submitted double-spaced.

All correspondence, manuscripts and subscriptions should be sent to:

Dr. James A. Santucci  
Department of Religious Studies  
California State University  
Fullerton, CA 92634-9480  
(U.S.A.)  
FAX: 7147733990  
Telephone: 7147733727

© 1991 by James A. Santucci

©Revised 2011 by James A. Santucci

## Contents

July 1990  
Volume 3, Number 3

### Editor's Comments

James Santucci.....70 [61]

**Letters**.....72 [63]

### A Brief Note

The *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings*: A Correction

John Cooper.....74 [65]

### Articles

The Hidden Hand, Part II: The Brotherhood of Light

Joselyn Godwin.....75 [66]

The Blavatsky-Gurdjieff Question: A Footnote on Maude Hoffman and A.T. Barker

James Moore.....87 [77]

The Mysterious Life and Transitions of the Cagliostro Jewel

Nell C. Taylor.....89 [79]

### Review of Books

James A. Santucci.....100 [88]

### Review of Letter and Notes

Review letters of *Blavatsky and Her Teachers*: Part I: "The Location of the 'Ravine in Tibet':

An examination of Jean Overton Fuller's *Blavatsky and Her Teachers*

Daniel Caldwell.....102 [90]

The Ravine in Tibet: A Reply to Mr. Caldwell

Jean Overton Fuller.....109 [96]

## Editor's Comments

*Theosophical History* has for the past two issues concentrated only on the publication of articles. Several readers have since suggested the inclusion of book reviews and letters as well, which has been our intention all along; only now, however, has it been feasible to do so. Two book reviews on J. Krishnamurti are contained herein: Ingram Smith's *Truth is a Pathless Land: A Journey with Krishnamurti* and Sidney Field's *Krishnamurti: The Reluctant Messiah*. In addition to these, the first part of an extended critique of Jean Overton Fuller's *Blavatsky and Her Teachers* by David Caldwell appears in this issue; the concluding part will appear in the next issue. A response to Mr. Caldwell's review from Miss Fuller is also included.

Three articles also appear in this issue. Joscelyn Godwin continues his series, "The Hidden Hand," James Moore writes on the relationship between G.I. Gurdjieff and H.P. Blavatsky, and Nell C. Taylor discusses Madame Blavatsky's Cagliostro Jewel and its fate.

James Moore has been active in British Gurdjieffian circles since 1956 and is the author of *Gurdjieff and Mansfield* (RKP 1980). In 1987, he led the first seminar on Gurdjieff's ideas at Oxford University, and in 1988 presented a film of Gurdjieff's *Sacred Dances* at Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand. He lives in London, where in 1989 he contributed to the Fourth International Conference on Theosophical History. His full-length biography, *Gurdjieff: the Anatomy of a Myth*, is expected to appear in October, 1991.

Miss Nell C. Taylor's career began as a research scientist at the Clayton Foundation Biochemical Institute, University of Texas from 1945 to 1965, followed by a position at the Pritikin Research Foundation in Santa Barbara from 1977 to 1985. As a member of the Theosophical Society (Adyar), Miss Taylor has written numerous articles and book reviews for Theosophical journals and served as secretary at the Krotona School of Theosophy in Ojai (CA) from 1967 to 1971. She currently resides in Santa Barbara, California.

Dr. Godwin's background was noted in the last issue. He is a member of the Department of Music at Colgate University (Hamilton, New York) and serves as an Associate Editor for *Theosophical History*.

Mr. Daniel H. Caldwell, a resident of Tucson, Arizona, has been researching the life and teachings of H.P. Blavatsky for the past twenty-three years. A native of Littlefield, Texas, he has a Master's Degree in Library Science from the University of Arizona. He is currently working on two projects concerning Madame Blavatsky, which will be published this year.

### ***Light***

Mr. John Cooper, one of this journal's Associate Editors, recently located, while on a lecture tour in New Zealand, the first nineteen volumes of the Spiritualist journal *Light*, which was then edited by M.A. Oxon (William Stainton Moses, b. 1839, d. 1893) and his successors. These volumes cover the years 1881 to 1899 inclusively. Researchers of the Theosophical Society will find a wealth of material in *Light*, including articles by M.A. Oxon, letters by Helena Blavatsky, information on Coleman, Coues, Collins, Eglinton, Kiddle, Sinnett, and much more. Many readers may also be aware of one significant article published in *Theosophical History* (1/7:175-87) from Volume 15 (1895), "The Real Origin of the Theosophical Society" by Quaestor Vitae.

Copies of this publication can be obtained from the Editor of *Theosophical History* (Dept. of Religious Studies, California State University, Fullerton, CA 92634-9480) at a cost of \$5 (U.S.) for postage and mailing.

### **Theosophical History Conference**

It was announced in the first number of this journal (III/1, January 1990) that an international conference on theosophical history and related topics was planned for June 1991. Unfortunately, the press of work in reorganizing the journal and bringing it up to date has prevented such an arrangement. The new target date for the conference will be early June or August 1992; the location will be Southern California (Los Angeles or San Diego). More information will appear in future issues as planning for the conference progresses. In the meantime, I welcome correspondence from readers who intend to participate and who might be willing to offer some assistance in organizing the conference.

**James A. Santucci**

\* \* \* \* \*

## Letters

*From Mr. Roger Worthington, F. T.S. (Kent, U. K.)*

I would like to congratulate you on the return of an important periodical. *Theosophical History* is both interesting and valuable and I am delighted that someone has been able to pick up the work started by Leslie Price which forms a significant contribution to theosophical literature and which will become increasingly valuable as time passes. Memories fade and documents disappear and there is a finite time during which such research can be carried out.

The article on Prof. John Smith in Vol. III, Part I I found particularly interesting; such comments as “until quite recently ... Physics was known as Natural Philosophy” and “he argued that medicine was as much as art based on observation and experience as a science” especially revealing in the light of modern trends of thought.

*From Mr. Andrew Rawlinson (Lancaster, England)*

I wonder if you have any bibliographical suggestions for following up the esoteric connections of Count Hermann Keyserling (the subject of the first chapter of Rom Landau's *God is My Adventure?* We have a research student here who is doing a Ph.D. on him. Or if you haven't any leads, maybe you know of someone who does.

I am glad that *Theosophical History* is continuing. Although it is somewhat tangential to my own research interests, I have found that it contains a lot of useful material which has helped me in my work. That is one of the signs of a first-rate journal, I think (when non-specialists find it stimulating).

*If any reader can help Mr. Rawlinson on Count Hermann Keyserling, please send all information to the editor of Theosophical History. The information will be then be forwarded to the correspondent.*

*From Mr. Vincente Hao Chin Jr. (Quezon City, Philippines)*

The articles of April 1990 are good.

Perhaps you could feature regularly a book review, and a section on miscellaneous news and notes that has relevance to theosophical history. Also, letters.

*From this issue on, letters and book reviews will be a regular feature.*

*We do urge correspondence on any point of historical interest covered by the journal, including articles printed elsewhere and ongoing research.*

*From Mr. Joseph Ross (Santa Barbara, CA)*

After seeing and reading the second issue of *Theosophical History*, I would like to propose a suggestion for a new title: “Perspectives in *Theosophical History*,” plus a com-

ment or two on that we should not forget to remember that the only valid reason for studying history lies in its lessons for the present. The gratifying of curiosity as a selling motive is less important although it has its uses. The real importance of history viewed as the experience of that unity called Mankind, is Mankind knowing Himself.

For if we view history as “those people” doing whatever, we merely further the separatist attitude. To make the magazine of real service there needs to be a brief editorial statement in each issue, of the policy embodying the idea of its usefulness in helping us to further the enlightenment of humanity by seeing events as they are.

A good beginning, looking forward to future issues!

*Any comment on Mr. Ross' observation will be welcome.*

\* \* \* \* \*

# **The H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings: A Correction**

**By John Cooper**

In editing the Collected Letters of H.P. Blavatsky I am analyzing much of the material available on her life and writings. Through the kindness of The Theosophical Society, with Headquarters at Pasadena, I have received copies of all the Blavatsky letters and telegrams in their Archive, including a telegram dated 18 October 1889 from Blavatsky to Judge. This telegram enables a correction to be made to the "Open Letter to All the Fellows of the Theosophical Society" in the H.P. Blavatsky: *Collected Writings* XI: 55160. This telegram also allows us to date the circular at about mid-October 1889.

In the telegram mentioned above H.P.B. asks that a correction be made, so that the third line on page 553 should read:

I received Mr. Lane's application for the Esoteric Section with Mr. Judge's recommendation.

The underlined words replace "Theosophical Society."

Mr. Judge sent a circular to the Esoteric Section dated 23 October 1889, in which he slightly modified the correction to read: "Mr. Lane's application for the Esoteric Section of the Theosophical Society."

This correction makes more sense of the original as H.P.B. would not be required to approve applications for the Theosophical Society.

\* \* \* \* \*



## **The Hidden Hand, Part II: The Brotherhood of Light**

**By Joscelyn Godwin**

Emma Hardinge-Britten (1823–1899), writing as “One Who Knows” in her periodical *The Two Worlds*,<sup>1</sup> defends her claim to be considered “an exponent of true Occultism” by relating that, before she was thirteen, a group of upper-class ladies and gentlemen sought her out to observe her “somnambulist” faculties. For several years she and some other young persons took part in their experiments.

The persons thus came into contact with were representatives of many other countries than Great Britain. They formed one of a number of secret societies they claimed an affiliation with societies derived from the ancient mysteries of Egypt, Greece, and Judaea they claimed that alchemy, mediaeval Rosicrucianism, and modern Freemasonry were off-shoots of the original Cabala, and that during the past 150 years new associations had been formed, and the parties who had introduced me into their arcanum were a society in affiliation with many others then in existence in different countries .... I am at liberty to say that Lord Lytton, the Earl of Stanhope, and Lieut. Morrison (better known as “Zadkiel”), and the author of “Art Magic,” belonged to this society.

I should have known but little of its principles and practices, as I was simply what I should now call a clairvoyant, sought out by the society for my gifts in this direction, had I not, in later years, been instructed in the fundamentals of the society by the author of “Art Magic.” When modern spiritualism dawned upon the world, for special reasons of my own, the fellows of my society gave me an honorary release from every obligation I had entered into with them except in the matter of secrecy.

This Orphic Circle was magical and experimental in nature, its method largely that of scrying (crystal-gazing) with the assistance of child mediums. The most famous of those who had pursued analogous researches in the past were John Dee, whose scryers included Edward Kelly, and Alessandro Cagliostro, who used boys and girls as his visionaries. Closer in time and place was Francis Barrett (1765–1825) who brought the practice to wider notice in his popular book *The Magus, or Celestial Intelligencer* (1801), where he advertised himself as giving instruction in occult sciences (Barrett 1801, 11: 135ff). Perhaps Barrett had been the founder of the circle in question. Of those whom Emma names, Lord Lytton is of course Bulwer Lytton (1803–1873), author of *Zanoni* (1842) and other novels of the occult. The Earl of Stanhope is presumably the Fourth Earl (1781–1855), a Fellow of the Royal Society and brother of the flamboyant Lady Hester Stanhope, whose career as a kind of feminine Messiah to the Arabs of Syria is another story. The Earl himself took an interest in the case of the enigmatic Caspar Hauser, and

paid to support the boy until his death.<sup>2</sup> Zadkiel, or Lieutenant Richard Morrison (1795-1874), was the most visible English astrologer of his century (Howe 1967:33-50), who made no secret of his scrying, actually writing to the press in the 1850s with accounts of his experiments.<sup>3</sup>

I think that it is plausible to accept the first part of *Ghost Land*, first published by Emma in 1872 in her periodical *The Western Star*, as a novelistic description of this society and its activities. The author of that book, the still unidentified Chevalier Louis de B\_\_\_\_, tells there of how he contacted the “Orphic Circle” in London circa 1847, when he was about twenty-two and already experienced in mediumship. He says that soon afterwards, when the news of the Hydesville phenomena arrived in London, efforts were made by the Orphic Circle to emulate the new American spiritualism (Anonymous 1897:199).

Louis hints that above and beyond such magical and experimental groups there is one quite different secret society.

Its actual nature is only recognized, spoken, or thought of as a dream, a memory of the past, evoked like a phantom from the realms of tradition or myth; yet as surely as there is a spirit in man, is there in the world a spiritual, though nameless and almost unknown association of men, drawn together by the bonds of soul, associated by those interior links which never fade or perish, belonging to all times, places and nations alike. Few can attain to the inner light of these spiritually associated brethren, or apprehend the significance of their order; enough that it is, has been, and will be, until all men are spiritualized enough to partake of its exalted dispensations. Some members of this sublime Brotherhood were in session in England, and their presence it was which really sent thither my master and myself, at the time of which I write (Ibid.:68f.)

What Emma understood by these lines of her master is not known; there is of course no particular reason to take them as true, any more than other accounts of “Unknown Superiors.” However, by the 1870s she was herself a member of a different order called the “Brotherhood of Light,” which seems to have had a definite relationship with the activities and ideals of the mysterious orders of *Ghost Land* and of Emma’s youth.<sup>4</sup> Let us hear the official story of how this brotherhood was founded, written by Peter Davidson in 1887. (He calls it the “H. B. of L.,” i.e. the Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor.<sup>5</sup>)

In 1870 (and not in 1884, as the January number of *The Theosophist* says), an adept of the serene, ever-existing and ancient Order of the H. B. of L., after having obtained the consent of his Brother initiates, resolved to choose a neophyte in Great Britain who would answer to his plans.

After having performed an important private mission on the European continent, he went to England in 1873 and discovered by chance a neophyte who satis-

fied his ideas; after having thoroughly tested him and had his credentials verified, he gradually instructed this neophyte ....

The neophyte in question then obtained permission to establish an Exterior Circle of the H.B. of L., and thus to prepare all those who deserved it among the members for the form of initiation for which they were qualified ...<sup>6</sup>

There is plenty of evidence that this Order existed in the 1880s; but what interests us far more is the claim that it began as early as 1870, for this would lend credibility to the idea that it was involved in the beginnings of the Theosophical Society. Unfortunately we have only its own word for it.

However, there are a number of coincidences, insignificant if taken separately, which might together point to something of the kind. First, Lieutenant Morrison, mentioned as a member of the earlier Orphic Circle, promoted in his 1870 almanac (published 1869) "The Most Ancient Order of the Suastika (*sic*), or Brotherhood of the Mystic Cross," with an apprentice membership half a guinea.<sup>7</sup> Morrison died in February 1874, but the name of this order, at least, survived him.

Second, in October and November 1873 the English occultist Francis George Irwin (1823–1898), who for years had been crystal gazing with his son Herbert as seer, was contacted by an entity that called itself "Count Cagliostro," and given, through the crystal, the history and rituals of an order calling itself the *Fratres Lucis*, "Brothers of Light" (Hamill 1986: 22f; Howe 1972: 257ff). Irwin was a retired Army officer and an avid pursuer of fringe and occult Masonry. "Cagliostro" told him that the *Fratres Lucis* had originated in fourteenth century Florence' (where, he said, they still existed), and had numbered among their members Ficino, Fludd, Thomas Vaughan, Saint Germain, Martin de Pasqually, Swedenborg, Schüssler, Mesmer, and Cagliostro himself. Other names used for the order were "Brotherhood of the Cross of Light" and "Order of [swastika symbol]," the latter surely a borrowing from Morrison. Its objects were the study and practice of "Natural Magic, Mesmerism, the Science of Death and of Life, Immortality, the Cabbala, Alchemy, Necromancy, Astrology and Magic in all its branches" (Howe 1972:260).

There had been a much earlier order called the *Fratres Lucis*, otherwise the "Asiatic Brethren of St. John the Evangelist in Europe," founded in Germany 1780 or 1781 by Hans Heinrich von Ecker und Eckhoffen and thought to have been extinguished early in the nineteenth century. As Christopher McIntosh says, "Its symbolism and ritual practice were an extraordinary amalgam of Jewish elements, Christian mysticism, alchemy and mystical Freemasonry."<sup>8</sup> But there is no visible continuity between that order and the one that used the same name in the 1870s. The mythology of Irwin's Brotherhood of Light is dominated by the figure of Cagliostro, founder of Egyptian Masonry and martyr to the Roman Inquisition, who likewise does not figure in the records of the earlier *Fratres Lucis*.

Francis Irwin enrolled a very few friends in his *Fratres Lucis*: we know of Benjamin Cox, admitted in 1875 after being kept waiting for nearly a year (Howe 1972:258f); William Hockley, another veteran researcher into crystal gazing; and the Masonic histo-

rian Kenneth Mackenzie, admitted in 1876 at the earliest (Hamill 1986:23). To these we should add Irwin's son Herbert, who until his untimely death acted as the medium for his father's investigations. Mackenzie's versatile but frittered talents enabled the Brotherhood to acquire a wider, though no less mysterious, reputation: in his *Royal Masonic Cyclopaedia* of 1875–1877 he calls it “a mystic order, established in Florence in 1498. Among the members of this Order were Pasqualis, Cagliostro, Swedenborg, Saint-Martin, Eliphas Levi, and many other eminent mystics. Its members were much persecuted by the Inquisition. It is a small but compact body, the members being spread all over the world.” (Mackenzie 1877:453) Levi, whom Mackenzie had visited, had died in 1875 and hence could neither confirm nor deny his membership.

Mackenzie had earlier hinted at the existence of a secret order called the “Hermetic Order [or “Hermetic Brothers”] of Egypt.” In an article for the Rosicrucians' journal (Mackenzie 1874), he said that he had known only six members, of whom two were Germans and two Frenchmen. In adapting the description for his *Cyclopaedia*, he revised this estimate:

The body is never very numerous, and if we may believe those who at the present time profess to belong to it, the philosopher's stone, the elixir of life, the art of invisibility, and the power of communication directly with the ultramundane life, are parts of the inheritance they possess. The writer has met with only three persons who maintained the actual existence of this body of religious philosophers, and who hinted that they themselves were actually members (Mackenzie 1877:309).

In Mackenzie's semi-fictional scheme of things, this Hermetic Brotherhood of Egypt seems to bear an analogous relation to the *Fratres Lucis* as the unnamed secret society of *Ghost Land* did to the Orphic Circle. Both exemplify the principle of Unknown Superiors behind the societies that can be joined and the adepts who can be named.

William Hockley would also have been familiar with this kind of arrangement, having been instructed years before (probably in the mid-1850s) by his spirit guide, the “Crowned Angel of the Seventh Sphere,” about “that sacred society of which the Fathers are in Jerusalem ... followers of the Rosy Cross.” Members of this order “study the occult sciences after an interview with an invisible power.” Hockley's ghostly informant added that both Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Napoleon I had been members, and that if Hockley wanted to join, he would have to go to France. His letters show that he did visit Paris, but nobody knows what happened to him there (Hamill 1986:16).

Francis Irwin, for his part, was in Paris early in 1874, and claimed to have met with a warm reception there from members of the *Fratres Lucis*. In a confidential memorandum “To Aspirants Only,” Irwin says that five years before—i.e., in 1869—there had been only twenty-seven members in all (Howe 1972:259). Evidently this order, or its various branches, was a very modest affair.

However, their connections with France, coupled with the allusions in our sources to an “important private mission” in Paris on behalf of the Brotherhood of Light, put one on the alert. Was it not in June 1873 that Madame Blavatsky, who had settled in

Paris with her cousin, was suddenly interrupted by an “order from the Brotherhood” to go to America? From the French side there are rumors that the order was accompanied by a gift of 25,000 francs from Lady Caithness.<sup>9</sup> This remarkable lady deserves a special study. Born in Spain and bearer also of the Papal title Duchess of Pomár (through her first husband), she had been involved in Spiritualism at least since the London Dialectical Society’s investigation of spiritualistic phenomena in 1869 (Anonymous 1925:17), where she would have encountered, among other testifiers, Emma Hardinge-Britten and William Hockley. In 1874 Lady Caithness herself went to America, and visited important Spiritualists including the Brittens in Philadelphia.<sup>10</sup> Along with Charles Sotheran, she is a likely link between the three centers of Paris, London, and the American East Coast.

The question that now arises is whether Mme. Blavatsky’s mission to go to America could have been part of the same impulse as the reorganization of the Brotherhood of Light. Paul Johnson has recently shown, in his challenging book *In Quest of the Masters*, the role of Albert Rawson, Charles Sotheran, and others active in Cagliostro’s Egyptian Masonry in influencing her decision to leave Europe, and in guiding her once she was settled in New York. Their work, that of the British Fratres Lucis, and the contributions of Emma Hardinge-Britten and Lady Caithness begin to seem all of a piece.

As a last event of 1873, I would add that this was the year when the Reverend William Stainton Moses (1839–1893), having unexpectedly developed mediumistic gifts, received his first series of messages in automatic writing from a guide called “Imperator +.” Moses, who wrote under the pen-name of “M.A. (Oxon.),” was one of the best educated, and would become one of the most respected, of all Victorian mediums. We will see later something of his relations with Henry Olcott and the Theosophical Society.

Synchronism, however striking, is no proof of collusion. All esoteric orders must be known and judged, in the last analysis, by their fruits. A brief comparison of doctrines will show what sort of ideas were being given out during these crucial years. Here are some of the most important things that Stainton Moses learned through Imperator, mostly in 1873:

A new revelation is coming now (paraphrased from Moses 1933:131); We are doing for Christianity what Jesus did for Judaism (148)  
 The Bible is a compilation, not literally true (183)  
 Much of Jesus’s life is to be understood symbolically (256)  
 Modern Christianity is a degenerate offspring of the original (233)  
 Each religion is a ray of truth from the Central Sun (131)  
 There have been many Messiahs (212)  
 India is the source of all religions, and deserves to be studied (212)  
 The ancient Egyptians were wise and erudite philosophers (217); Jesus was educated there (262)  
 Man makes his own future, stamps his own character, suffers for his own sins, and must work out his own salvation (277)  
 The only devils are the ones you create yourself (98)  
 The spirit is a temporarily separated portion of divinity, which grows more and more like God (228)

The doctrine of transmigration is an error (218)  
In America, many have developed so as to speak to “us” directly (239)

Some of these thoughts were strong stuff for a rather stubborn Church of England curate (just how stubborn can be seen from Moses’ written objections to his guide). Imperator was trying patiently to give him a broader view of religion, and of reality, while at the same time playing down the vulgar Spiritualist themes of communication with the dead and physical phenomena, with which so many in the movement were obsessed. Whoever Imperator was—and Mme. Blavatsky thought he might simply be Moses’ own Higher Self (ML 1924:43)—his teaching was perfectly adjusted to the needs of this pupil, at least.

The 1870s are also the period of *Art Magic*, published in 1876, attributed to the “Chevalier Louis whose autobiographical sketches had appeared as *Ghost Land*, and likewise edited by Emma Hardinge-Britten. If it is true, as Mme. Blavatsky’s critics like to say, that most of *Isis Unveiled* was taken from a hundred books, then *Art Magic* must have been taken from about ten! It is not an impressive work, though it was launched with much ado in a supposedly limited edition. Eric Dingwall thought that it may have been by the Baron de Palm<sup>11</sup> but Emma had a considerable stake in its success and in the reputation of her master, the Chevalier Louis. She must have felt completely upstaged by the appearance of *Isis* the following year, treating the same kind of material as *Art Magic*, but on a far grander scale and with the advantage of learned collaboration from such as Sotheran and Wilder; she never had another good word to say for her former colleague. However, the perpetrators of *Art Magic* thought they were doing something important, and we can extract the following doctrines from the mass of irrelevant padding:

One God can be traced through all ancient faiths (paraphrased from Anonymous 1898:35)  
Jesus’s life is an allegory (50)  
Much of ancient religion concealed solar or phallic worship (637)  
India is the oldest source of wisdom (23)  
Besides the Jewish Cabbala there is an Oriental Cabbala, but its key is found only in Oriental fraternities (81)  
The Egyptian priests were masters of occult arts (187)  
The human being is triple: Body, Astral Spirit, and the deific Soul (124)  
Spirits have come from a heavenly, sexless state (this from a Hindu source) and lived on many earths before this one (29)  
Modern reincarnationism is a fantasy (83)  
There is evolution from elementals to humans, and from humans to angels and planetary spirits (93)  
One can contact spirits on all three levels (8792)  
Modern American Spiritualism marks a great spiritual outpouring (347)  
Spiritualism needs scientific investigation (362)

Certainly these were far broader doctrines than those held by most American Spiritualists. The author, and presumably the editor, were encouraging the study of the Western magical tradition and of Oriental religions, and teaching that Spiritualism includes commerce with sub-mundane elementals and super-mundane angels, as well as with the “mundane” spirits of the unprogressed human dead. The common run of Spiritualists, on the other hand, believed all manifestations to be due to the latter alone. The author of *Art Magic* had said categorically in *Ghost Land* that the great names that seem to communicate in *séances* are merely adaptations to our need for great names: a deception, but a kind one. And he goes on to say of Spiritualism: “This modern movement is but the chaotic reflection of the ignorance, bigotry, credulity, and materialism of the age. Still it is the first step towards breaking the seals of that apocalyptic age that is even now upon us.” (Anonymous 1897: 288)<sup>12</sup>

How close Mme. Blavatsky was to this movement appears from her earliest article, “A Few Questions to ‘Hiraf,’” published in *The Spiritual Scientist*, 15 and 22 July 1875. In these half-dozen pages, which she called “my first occult shot,” she manages to air, among others, the following ideas (as paraphrased from BCW I: 112):

This planet is a place of transition where we prepare for eternity. There is eternal progress for every living being (112)

The elementary spirits, often mistaken for those of the dead, are to us as we are to “Summer Land” (112)

Reincarnation is a “modern doctrine” (112)

Oriental philosophy denies the existence of Satan (111)

The Jewish religion is derived from the pagan Mysteries (118)

Ancient Cabalists knew as much as modern scientists (115)

Egyptian initiation took away the fear of death (115)

The Scriptures are full of secret meanings (114–115)

With the Hydesville rappings, the door is ajar (117)

Now Occultism needs to explain and alter much of Spiritualism (117)

These three doctrinal lists have a certain unanimity: they envisage a hierarchical universe and promise us eternal progress through it, though this does not necessarily involve reincarnation; they have a high regard for ancient and Eastern wisdom, and a low one for dogmatic Christianity; they imply that the Hydesville rappings of 1848 initiated an important era, but that the doctrines of Modern Spiritualism are inadequate. Much of *Isis Unveiled* would be a gigantic commentary on these themes. Yet there was nothing really new in them, at least to those familiar with the literature of Western esotericism and with recent scholarship in the history of religions. The novelty lay in their presentation in popular form, to a public already softened up by Spiritualism. As Louis put it:

The thoughts which shone in resplendent imagery before the eyes of my associates and myself a quarter of a century ago, have gradually been leavening the lump of civilized society during that whole period of time. (Anonymous 1897: 265)

The scattered evidence collected here will suggest different things to different persons, depending on their preconceptions. My own mind is open to the possibility of events for which materialistic science, and the historical scholarship modeled on it, has no place; consequently, I do not automatically dismiss the idea of immaterial influences, such as were suggested by many writers on the Hydesville incident. The triple purpose of this article is to furnish certain facts and references, which are not disputable; to suggest connections, whose significance is debatable (and should be debated); and to encourage speculation at the level for which Henry Corbin coined the valuable term of “hierohistory” (*hiérohistoire*): the superior or sacred history that gives meaning to earthly events. I would suggest that there was another hierohistorical event in the early 1870s; another move to affect public opinion, mainly by working from within the Spiritualist movement. The mediums in this case were not country folk like the Fox Sisters, but educated and articulate people, connected through the intersecting domains of Spiritualism, psychic research, magnetism, Freemasonry, etc.

There is circumstantial evidence that points to France as the immediate source of this impulse. Hockley was told that he would have to go there to be received by the “sacred society.” Irwin went to Paris himself and met members of the Brotherhood while gathering a small branch around him in England. Stainton Moses tuned in, as it were, and was contacted by an “Imperator” whose one bit of biographical revelation is that he studied at Paris (Moses 1933:182); before long, Moses was in the thick of things and knew all the *dramatis personae* of Spiritualism. Madame Blavatsky was in Paris when she received her orders to go to America, where she worked with Emma Hardinge-Britten, Henry Olcott, Charles Sotheran, and other people who may already have been known to such an occult center.<sup>13</sup> She wrote to Stainton Moses in 1875: “I was sent from Paris to America on purpose to prove the phenomena and their reality, and show the fallacy of the spiritualistic theory of spirits.” (Moses 1892:331; ODL 1:13)

We are now in a position to turn once more to that most teasing witness, C.G. Harrison, whose book, *The Transcendental World*, was mentioned in Part One of this article, and to reread his statements about Mme. Blavatsky. Harrison learnt from an unnamed but well-placed informant:

... that modern spiritualism is an experiment on modern civilization decided on, about fifty years ago, by a federation of occult brotherhoods for the purpose of testing its vitality and ascertaining whether it is capable of receiving new truths without danger ....

That the “aspect of the heavens” at the time of the birth of Madame Blavatsky frightened the “Conservatives,” and resulted in a kind of “coalition ministry,” which gave place to a Liberal one in the year 1841.

That a “Brother of the Left” revealed this fact to Madame Blavatsky in Egypt about twenty years ago [1873], that she returned to Europe immediately, and imposed certain terms as a condition of reception into an occult brotherhood in



Paris, which were indignantly refused; that she was subsequently received in America and expelled very shortly afterwards (Harrison 1896: 31f).

Following this account, we would have to suppose that it was the “Liberal” ministry that decided to launch the leaky vessel of Modern Spiritualism in Hydesville; while presumably the “occult brotherhood in Paris” was the Inner Circle of the Brotherhood of Light that was just then, in 1873, choosing one or more neophytes for public work. I shall return to this event, and to this “Brother of the Left,” in Part Four of this article, on “The Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor.”

A still more fantastic version is suggested by the mischievous historian of the Theosophical movement who lurks behind the pseudonym of “Narad Mani,” and who supplied much of the information for René Guénon’s account of early Theosophy.<sup>14</sup> Referring to Mme. Blavatsky’s failed attempt to start a “miracle club” in Cairo, he writes:

The truth is that from her adventure in Cairo until the foundation of her so-called Theosophical Society, Mme. Blavatsky, pushed by someone, was only playing an undignified comedy, whose purpose was to support secretly the politics of those [i.e., the Jesuits] in whose favour Des Mousseaux had once fought, when, affirming without proof that the psychic fluid or vital spirit was exactly the same thing as the diabolic agency, he accused mediums of being simply under diabolic possession, and gave to Spiritualism the name of Satanism (Mani 1911–1912:542).

It would certainly have been the height of irony for Mme. Blavatsky, of all people, to have ended up working on the side of the “Black Brothers,” whom even Harrison names among the practitioners of the Left Hand Path. But it is naïve to suppose, as he and Narad Mani do, that she was nothing but a pawn in the hands of one or another manipulative group. H.P.B. was not, after all, a mere Katie Fox. And if for a time she worked with, and for, the Brotherhood of Light, they were soon to receive a rude shock, as will be described in Part Three of this article, “The Parting of East and West.”

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Leslie Price for obtaining a copy of this article (Hardinge-Britten 1887) for me. Emma’s authorship is confirmed by the repetition of much of it in her posthumous autobiography (Hardinge-Britten 1900: 3f.)

<sup>2</sup> See Hamill 1986: 36, 38n, on Lord Stanhope as purchaser of a crystal and supporter of Hauser. Johnson 1990 gives information on Lady Hester’s connections with Theosophy.

<sup>3</sup> See Howe 1967: 42, for a list of aristocratic witnesses of Morrison’s sessions.

<sup>4</sup> On Emma’s membership of the Brotherhood of Light, see Guénon 1952: 20f. Guénon’s information on this matter came from Félicien-Charles Barlet (= Albert Fauchaux), head of the “Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor” in France during the 1880s (Guénon 1965: 314).

<sup>5</sup> See Board 1988 for evidence that Luxor and Light are synonymous.

<sup>6</sup> Translated from Peter Davidson's essay, "Origine et Objet de l'H.B. of L.," in Anonymous 1988: 4.

<sup>7</sup> Howe 1967: 46. Hockley calls it by the second name in a note recorded in Hamill 1986: 91. Morrison habitually used the sign of the swastika on his publications.

<sup>8</sup> Citation from Christopher McIntosh's forthcoming book on the Gold- and Rosen-kreuz. See also Waite 1924: 503–528.

<sup>9</sup> See Mani 26 Oct. 1911: 469; but compare Henry Olcott's story (ODL 1: 440), which shows Mme. Blavatsky living in poverty on her arrival in New York, while waiting to deliver some 23,000 francs, given her by her Master, to its destined recipient.

<sup>10</sup> Caithness 1876: 117. This book is so similar in doctrine to *Art Magic* and *Isis Unveiled* (its sole divergence being in Lady Caithness's belief in reincarnation) that I suspect that the three women were, at the time of writing, consciously working towards a common goal.

<sup>11</sup> See his Introduction to Hardinge-Britten 1970: xvi.

<sup>12</sup> Emma Hardinge-Britten had been teaching many of these things for years: her *Six Lectures* in 1860 read like a sketch for *Art Magic*, which is plausible if, as she says, Louis taught her all she knew in the way of doctrine.

<sup>13</sup> Emma had been in Paris as a child-Medium, and again in 1855 just before she first went—or "was sent"—to America. Olcott had been in London in 1870 and knew the Dialectical Society circle.

<sup>14</sup> If he was not, indeed, Guénon himself.

## REFERENCES

Anonymous  
1897      *Ghost Land*. 2nd ed. Chicago: Progressive Thinker Publishing Co.

Anonymous  
1898      *Art Magic, or Sub-Mundane, Mundane and Super-Mundane Spiritualism*.  
Second ed. Chicago: Progressive Publishing House,

Anonymous  
1925      *The Theosophical Movement 1875-1925. A History and a Survey*. New  
York: Dutton.

- Anonymous  
1988 *H. B. of L. Textes et documents secrets de la Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor.* Milan: Archè.
- Barett, Francis  
1801 *The Magus, or Celestial Intelligencer.* London: Lackington & Allen.
- Board, David  
1988 "The Brotherhood of Light and the Brotherhood of Luxor." *Theosophical History*, Vol. 2, No. 5 (Jan 1987):149–57.
- BCW: H. P. Blavatsky  
*Collected Writings.* Adyar and Wheaton: Theosophical Publishing House. 15 volumes (with Index).
- Caithness, Countess of  
1876 *Old Truths in a New Light.* London.
- Guénon, René  
1952 *L'Erreur Spirite.* 2nd ed. Paris: Editions Traditionnelles.  
1965 *Le Théosophisme, histoire d'une pseudoreligion.* Rev, and aug. ed. Paris: Editions Traditionnelles.
- Hamill, John, ed.  
1986 *The Rosicrucian Seer. Magical Writings of Frederick Hockley.* Wellingborough: Aquarian.
- Hardinge-Britten, E.  
1860 *Six Lectures on Theology and Nature.* Chicago.  
1887 "Occultism Defined" [by "Sirius"]. *The Two Worlds* 1/1 (18 Nov.):35.  
1900 *Autobiography of Emma Hardinge-Britten.* Ed. Margaret Wilkinson. London: John Heywood.  
1970 *Modern American Spiritualism.* New Hyde Park: University Books.
- Harrison, C. G.  
1896 *The Transcendental World.* Second ed. London: George Redway.
- Howe, Ellic  
1967 *Astrology: A Recent History.* New York: Walker & Co. British edition entitled *Urania's Children.*

- 1972 "Fringe Masonry in England 1870-85." *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum* 85:242-95.
- Johnson, Paul  
1990 *In Quest of the Masters*. South Boston, Va: Author.
- Mackenzie, Kenneth R. H.  
1874 "The Aims of Rosicrucian Science." *The Rosicrucian* Vol. 2, Issue 24 (May): 107-109.
- 1877 *The Royal Masonic Cyclopaedia of History, Rites, Symbolism and Biography*. Edited by Kenneth R. McKenzie, IX°. Title shortened in his dedication to *The Cyclopaedia of Freemasonry*. Wellingborough: Aquarian Press.
- ML  
1924 *The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett from the Mahatmas M. and K. H.* Transcribed, compiled, and with an introduction by A. Trevor Barker. London: Theosophical Publishing House.
- Mani, Narad  
1911-12 "Baptême de Lumière." *La France Antimaçonnique*, various issues.
- Moses, William Stainton  
1892 "The early history of the Theosophical Society." *Light* 9 July: 330-32; 23 July: 354-57.
- 1933 *Spirit Teachings through the mediumship of William Stainton Moses*. Eleventh ed. London: Spiritualist Alliance.
- ODL: Henry S. Olcott  
*Old Diary Leaves*. Six series. Vol. I, 2nd ed. (1941); Vol. II, 2nd ed. (1928); Vol. 5 (1932); Vol. 6 (1935). Adyar: Theosophical Publishing House. Vol. III (1904), Vol. IV (1910). London: Theosophical Publishing Society.
- Waite, A. E.  
1924 *The Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross*. London: Rider. [Reprinted New Hyde Park: University Books.]

\* \* \* \* \*

# **The Blavatsky Gurdjieff Question: A Footnote on Maude Hoffman and A. T. Barker**

**James Moore**

It is not difficult to see striking similarities between Helena Petrovna Blavatsky and George Ivanovitch Gurdjieff, nor is it difficult to see striking disparities. Each of them in an era when the convergent ideas of Darwin, Marx, and Freud threatened to rule out the noumenal as a domain meriting serious adult consideration offered to modern man a coherent model of an essentially sacred universe: a 'hearth' for man's lawful spiritual aspiration. This alone makes them neighborly. We do no service alike to their memory, to scholarship, or to the unknown springs of their teaching, if we load this affinity with a weight it will not safely bear. To deal justly with their markedly discrepant views would require an entire book, and surely a degree of knowledge and impartiality difficult to reach. Any rush to judgement must veer towards an ignoble polemic.

Gurdjieff's theoretical ideas (perhaps in contradistinction to his practical methods) were chiefly propagated in England by Piotr Demianovich Ouspensky (1878–1947) and by Alfred Richard Orage (1873–1934) in America. These two gifted and sincere men first put down their spiritual roots in theosophical ground: Ouspensky in St. Petersburg and Orage in Leeds. Both had relinquished theosophy long before they met Gurdjieff, and not with any animus. Indeed, Ouspensky briefly conferred with Annie Besant at Adyar as late as the second half of 1913.

Let us turn for a moment from Gurdjieff to mainstream theosophy. Shortly before his death on 26 June 1921, Alfred Percy Sinnett appointed as his sole legatee Miss Maude Hoffman (? –1953), who had tended him with a daughter's devotion during his last illness. In the light of differences lately arising between Mr. Sinnett and Mrs. Besant, Miss Hoffman herself elected to make public the Mahatma letters and chose as their editor Mr. Alfred Trevor Barker. Miss Hoffman was an American, a Shakespearean actress with some literary talent, and a friend of Mabel Collins, author of *Light on the Path*; Mr. Barker was a personal friend, who had been initially a member of the Parent Theosophical Society at Adyar and subsequently a member of the Point Loma Theosophical Society.

On 5 April 1919, when Mr. Baillie Weaver made the presentation of an honorarium to Mr. Sinnett at 146 Harley Street, Miss Hoffman was sharing that house with two distinguished ex-pupils of C. G. Jung, namely Dr. Henry Maurice Dunlop Nicoll (1884–1953) and Dr. James Carruthers Young (? –1950). Miss Hoffman and these two psychiatrists also jointly owned a weekend cottage at Chorley Wood in Buckinghamshire.

What is arguably significant to the Blavatsky Gurdjieff question is that Hoffman, Barker, Nicoll, and Young all became pupils of Ouspensky at 38 Warwick Gardens, Kensington during the autumn of 1921, and of Gurdjieff himself during the spring of 1922. In the autumn of 1922, all four became residential pupils at Gurdjieff's Institute for the Harmonious Development of Man, situated at the Prieuré at Fontainebleau-Avon.

Dr. Nicoll's and Dr. Young's accounts of their stay with Gurdjieff are tangential to our consideration here. Mr. Barker appears to have left no comparable personal record of his time at the Prieuré, but the unpublished journal of Miss Ethel Merston (1879– ?) places him there with reasonable reliability as early as Saturday 30 September 1922, the date the building was actually leased to Gurdjieff. Although frail, Mr. Barker was doing vigorous preparatory work as part of a tiny team consisting of Dr. Young and no less personages than Gurdjieff's wife, Julia Ostrowska, and Ouspensky's wife, Sophie Grigorievna. His continued presence there is corroborated by Katherine Mansfield's undoubtedly reliable letter of 19 November 1922 to John Middleton Murry. Maude Hoffman's account of her even longer Prieuré stay was published in the *New York Times* (10 February 1924, Section VII, 13). The legatee of A. P. Sinnett, the custodian of the Mahatma letters, says of Gurdjieff: You get a first impression of a nature of great kindness and sensitiveness. Later you learn that in him is combined strength and delicacy, simplicity and subtlety. The key words of the Gurdjieff Institute are 'work' and 'effort'. Nothing is made easy in this place.

To calibrate all this with the actual editing and publication of the Mahatma letters and to draw sensible inferences would demand a more intimate knowledge of theosophical chronology and of successive editions than I, a Gurdjieffian, possess. The key may have disappeared with the death of Maude Hoffman on 20 June 1953; up to the last she remained in close touch with Dr. Nicoll, who had become one of the chief expositors of Gurdjieff's ideas.

Then do we lose ourselves in dreamy historical speculation? Or do we struggle to bear witness here and now in our diurnal round to the perennial vitality of an esoteric impulse which, though it finally transcends history, requires on this plane an apt human instrument?

\* \* \* \* \*

# THE MYSTERIOUS LIFE AND TRANSITIONS OF THE CAGLIOSTRO JEWEL

**Nell C. Taylor**

Imagine a silver and gold pendant shaped as a jeweled compass, surmounted by an emerald-studded crown, carrying between the arms of the compass a cross of rubies above a gold and silver pelican feeding its young in a nest. Imagine further that the gem stones in the emblem are living galvanometers responding to the vital vibrations of its owner. Such is a description of the mysterious 18th Degree Rosicrucian Jewel, formerly belonging to Cagliostro, but in recent times worn by H.P. Blavatsky. Set with yellow, green, white and red gems, the pure white stones “had the occult property of changing their color to a dark green and sometimes muddy brown, when she was out of health.”<sup>1</sup>

What do we know about the history of this remarkable jewel?<sup>2</sup> Is it valuable because of the precious gems and metals comprising it? Is it coveted for its astonishing occult properties, or as a talisman? For its association with the Rosicrucians? With Cagliostro? With H.P.B? Perhaps all of these. But what is certain, and what is important is that the jewel is a historical landmark and belongs in the archives of the Theosophical Society.

H.P.B. wrote in her diary of 1878, on 2 December, “Found the Rosy Cross Jewel missing from the bureau drawer. Know who took it. It will come back.”<sup>3</sup>

And it did come back. The adept Serapis refers to it in a brief note to Olcott, “The lost one is restored in its proper place. The gueburs [mischievous elementals] made it invisible out of malice.”<sup>4</sup> And other people have been solicitous for the keeping of this Jewel.

But first let us look at the physical structure of the jewel. Its most recent owner was Rukmini Devi Arundale, deceased 23 February 1986, the wife of Dr. George Arundale, third International President of the Theosophical Society.

The accompanying diagram was prepared from a sketch made by Joseph E. Ross in 1978, with her permission, and from notes on the gems he made at the time.





the head of the bird. . . . the head of the phoenix being far more like that of an eagle than of a pelican. In the Mysteries it was customary to refer to initiates as phoenixes or men who had been born again for just as physical birth gives man consciousness in the physical world, so the neophyte, after nine degrees in the womb of the Mysteries, was born into a consciousness of the spiritual world.<sup>9</sup>

H.P.B. devotes considerable attention to the meanings of the cross and circle.<sup>10</sup> The compass, being the instrument for constructing a circle, symbolizes the abstract Deity—thus, the rationale for including it in the 18th Degree Jewel. The equal-armed cross of rubies, represents man in incarnation, enclosed within the arms of the compass—the cross representing man’s divine aspect, the rose color, the symbol of Nature and virgin Earth, the celestial mother and nourisher of man.<sup>11</sup> Above the compass is the crown, emblem of royalty, shedding its beneficent aura over all the symbols of the Jewel. In Oriental scriptures, the highest spiritual teachings are called “the Royal Secret Doctrine.”<sup>12</sup>

### **Who Was Cagliostro?**

For readers unacquainted with the history of the Rosicrucians or Cagliostro, the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross, H.P.B. says, was founded in the mid-thirteenth century by a German knight named Rosencranz.<sup>13</sup> As the Christian religion is divided into various sects, so the Rosicrucian sect subsequently gave birth to other Cabalistic branches of Masonry.

Of the life of Count Alessandro di Cagliostro, little is known, but much is presumed. Most of his biographers depict him as quite a scoundrel and connect him with a Giuseppe Balsamo, a native of Sicily. H.P.B. remarks in her article “Was Cagliostro a ‘Charlatan’?” that this was a symbolic name, likely given to him by his adept teacher, as was customary for disciples destined to work in the world.<sup>14</sup> Validity for his title, however, can be traced to a distant relative through his maternal grandmother’s family. Dates of his life are estimated to be 1743 to 1795.

After a somewhat stormy youth, the still young Cagliostro went to Malta and there studied the Mysteries. He always told people he was born in Malta, meaning that he was there born into the spiritual life, there first initiated into magical rites.

Ordinarily he was the most captivating and charming of gentlemen, kind to the afflicted and generous to the indigent. But when hypocrisy goaded him too much, he could exhibit a violent temper.

In the early 1770s, while living in England, Cagliostro and his wife Serafina were very poor, and at first earned their living by selling his drawings. Later they lived in wealth. Cagliostro was reputed to be able to enlarge pearls and to transmute base materials into gem stones and precious metals. In London, he was initiated into Freemasonry in the Scottish rite. Cagliostro travelled to many cities in Europe, some in Russia, in each place establishing Masonic lodges. His powers of healing were spectacular. Wherever he travelled his reputation preceded him, and large crowds sought his drawing room. He never took money for treatment and was persecuted by the medical

authorities for practicing medicine without certification. When life became too complicated in one place, he moved to another.

In France, Cagliostro was held in great esteem by many noblemen and royalty. Goethe and Schiller were among his admirers. A scheming Countess de la Motte implicated him in a scandal involving a diamond necklace allegedly ordered by Marie Antoinette. For this, both Cagliostro and his wife were for a time incarcerated in the Bastille until he could prove their innocence. His indiscretion in demonstrating his alchemical powers—making diamonds and gold “out of nothing”—perhaps, one may surmise, led to these quick karmic results.

Cagliostro was a clairvoyant who predicted many incidents which actually came to pass. Furthermore, other remarkable predictions from mediumistic children he utilized in his masonic lodges also came to pass. Among those attending his meetings were priests and high churchmen, including Cardinal de Rohan, himself of the royal family. But Cagliostro’s being a Mason and an occultist and knowing “many secrets—deadly to the Church of Rome”<sup>15</sup> brought him the persecution of the Jesuits.

He worked, in 1785, in the Lodge of Philalethes along with Mesmer and other professional, literary, legal, financial, and clerical men. He attempted to bring into it the Eastern teaching of the divine and intermediate principles in man. But they refused to give up their traditional forms. He remained a Mason, but created his own ritual in the Egyptian tradition.

A letter of 1789 refers to the Count di Cagliostro and his wife arriving in Italy, having great wealth and being sought by many for private interviews. In 1790, he, his wife and a Capuchin monk were arrested and brought before the Inquisition. On April 7, 1791, he was condemned to death after a lengthy trial, lengthy because they could find no suitable evidence to prove his guilt. His books and family possessions were burnt in a public square.

As he was about to be turned over to civil authorities, a stranger appeared at the Vatican and demanded a private audience with the Pope, sending him a word instead of a name. He was received immediately by the Pope and shortly after, the Pope commuted the sentence to life imprisonment in the Castle of San Leo. He was reported to have died in prison, but some say he escaped and that the jailors, to save face, had to pretend that he died and was buried below the Castle.

Cagliostro, along with his contemporary, the Count de St. Germain, was believed to have discovered the secret of longevity and thus appeared again in 1861.<sup>16</sup> H.P.B. says, “The Count de Saint-Germain is, until this very time, a living mystery... The countless authorities we have in literature, as well as in oral tradition (which sometimes is the more trustworthy) about this wonderful Count’s having been met and recognized in different centuries, is no myth.”<sup>17</sup> And quoting Eliphas Levi that “Cagliostro, who died forsaken in the cells of the Inquisition,” H.P.B. in a footnote says, “This is false, and the Abbe Constant (Eliphas Levi) knew it was so.”<sup>18</sup>

## Chronology of the Jewel

To outline the transitions of ownership of the Cagliostro Jewel during the past one hundred and more years, we have seen that H.P.B. in 1878 noticed it gone from her bureau drawer, and that it came back to her. How she came to have it initially, Rukmini Arundale, interviewed by Joseph Ross, said, "During the French Revolution, Cagliostro was really very busy and working with the Master, the Prince [Count Saint Germain]. I don't know how H.P.B. got it, but she saw him on the physical plane. He was evidently still living somewhere. So, he gave it to her, for the real Masonic Order is there. And she gave it to Dr. Besant."<sup>19</sup>

Annie Besant said late in 1893 that she saw evidence supporting the rumors that William Q. Judge had forged messages from the Master.<sup>20</sup> In 1894, she issued a "Statement Prepared for the Judicial Committee" containing six charges of untruthfulness in his claimed communications with the Master. Charge III was titled "Deception Practised Toward H.S. Olcott with regard to the Rosicrucian Jewel of H. P. B." <sup>21</sup>

Mrs Besant described the Jewel incident in her pamphlet on the case, published in 1895:

... at Colonel Olcott's request she [H.P.B.] lent it to him, and it remained in his possession when H.P.B. finally left India in 1885.

In 1888, when Colonel Olcott came to England, he brought over a number of H.P.B.'s things for her, this Rosicrucian Jewel among them, and handed it over to her at 17, Lansdowne Road. She sometimes wore this Jewel afterwards, and it was among H.P.B.'s things after her death. Mr. Judge saw it among them when he came over to London in May, 1891.

In August, 1891, after Mr. Judge had returned to New York, I received a letter from him, on which was written an order in the Mahatma M's script desiring me to send this Rosicrucian Jewel to Mr. Judge. I accordingly sent the Jewel carefully packed in a sealed packet to New York by Colonel Olcott (the Colonel knowing nothing of the contents of the packet), he handed the packet to Mrs. J.C. Ver Planck, who wrote to me acknowledging the receipt, and said she would lock it away. I also wrote Mr. Judge, telling him that I had sent the Jewel by Colonel Olcott.

On September 12th, 1891, Mr. Judge, writing in the train, and dating 'In Wyoming on the R.R.', wrote me: —

"Yes, it is the silver phoenix. I will tell J.C.V.P. to keep the package in my safe."...

In October, 1891, when Colonel Olcott was at the house of Dr. J. Anderson, in San Francisco, he was telling Dr. A. about H.P.B.'s Rosicrucian Jewel and the mysterious property possessed by the stones in it, of changing colour with the state of her health. In this connection the Colonel remarked that he had the Jewel at Adyar, and when he got back there would look and see if the stones had changed colour since H.P.B.'s death. Mr. Judge was present at this conversation. On hearing this last remark he said to Colonel Olcott:

"Olcott, the Master tells me to say that He has taken the Jewel away from Adyar, and that when you get back you will find it gone. Let this be a proof to you of the genuineness of the communications that I receive from the Mahatmas."

After his return to Adyar, Colonel Olcott recounted what had occurred to B. Keightley, who thereupon said that he had seen the Colonel give the jewel to H.P.B. in London in 1888 or 1889. His servant Babula corroborated, saying that he had himself put the jewel in the Colonel's trunk .”<sup>22</sup>

In the same pamphlet, similar evidence is given in a statement by Bertram Keightley:

... in 1888, I was present in H.P.B.'s room when H.S.O. gave to H.P.B. the Rosicrucian-Jewel...” and that in 1891, “while driving up to Adyar Headquarters from the harbour on his return H.S.O. related to me his conversation with W.Q.J. in San Francisco... I at once reminded H.S.O. that he had given the Rosicrucian Jewel to H.P.B. as above described in 1888 in London. I was also present when Babula reminded H.S.O. that he (Babula) had himself packed the Jewel in H.S.O.'s trunk when H.S.O. was going to Europe in 1888.”<sup>23</sup>

On July 18, 1894, a joint statement by Judge and Olcott give conflicting reports of the incident of 1891:

William Q. Judge & Col. H.S. Olcott hereby together agree in writing that the following states what ...Judge said ...in Oct. 1891 at Dr. Anderson's house.

W.Q. Judge says: “Col. Olcott having stated that the Jewel was at Adyar, I went into my room adjoining. In a few moments I came back to Col. Olcott's room and said to him, ‘Col., Master says I may tell you that the Jewel is not at Adyar and you will not find it there.’ No more was said and not a single word was uttered by me to the effect that Master had taken the Jewel away.”

“Col. Olcott says: ‘My recollection of the incident differs from the above. At the same time, as no notes of the conversation were made by me at the time, it is but fair to say that my memory is as likely to have misled me as Mr. Judge's or Dr. Anderson's to have misled them. The scene occurred, to the best of my recollection, in Mr. Judge's bedroom...; the persons present were Dr. Anderson, Mr. Judge and myself... I described to Dr. Anderson the well-known Rosicrucian jewel... I said that on returning to Adyar I should ...see whether the crystals had resumed their proper hue or perhaps turned black since H.P.B.'s death. Judge, who was standing next me...said, ‘Olcott, the Master tells me that you will not find the jewel at Adyar...’ ...I should be disposed ...to indicate that the Master had taken it away, but my memory fails me in this respect and I will not venture to say that such words were spoken. The clear impression made on me, however . . . is that Judge was giving me a test of his power to get communications from the Masters; and. ...as soon as I got to Adyar I hunted for the jewel, and then discovered that I had myself taken it to London in 1888 and returned it to H.P.B. herself. [Signed] H.S. Olcott, London 18 July 1894.”<sup>24</sup>

In preparation for his defense against charges brought against him to the General Council, Judge telegraphed to Dr. Anderson, June 18, 1894, that one charge was that Judge told Olcott the Master said the Jewel was not at Adyar, and asks Anderson to mail

at once an affidavit whether this was true or false. Surprisingly, Anderson's notarized reply stated:

There did not to the best of my recollection and belief, occur in my presence any conversation between them relative to the Rosicrucian jewel of the late Madame H.P. Blavatsky, nor was there in my presence any statements to the effect that "Judge told him (Olcott) Master then said that the Jewel was not at Adyar," as quoted in a telegram hereunto attached, nor was there any reference to said jewel nor to Master in this or any cognate connection.... That the conversation referred to in the telegram hereunto attached did not occur, and that there is no lapse on the part of my memory will be appreciated when I state that this was the first time I had ever had the pleasure of meeting Col. Olcott, and the first time I had ever had the opportunity of conversation with Mr. Judge, and, owing to the prominent connection of both with the Society, I was both attentive and watchful for any hint as to the Society, generally, and any mention of the Masters, particularly, as I was most intensely eager for information concerning the latter. [Signed] Jerome A. Anderson, M.D."<sup>25</sup>

Now follows a gap of nearly three years wherein the writer has not been able to trace the actual location of the Jewel. It is of record that Mr. Judge or Mrs. Ver Planck had it in September 1891. Mrs. Ver Planck wrote to Mrs. Besant, 23 September 1891:

I note your instructions re packet. Mr. Judge has told me to place it, endorsed, in the safe of Mr. Neresheimer, as our own here is used by several persons.

And again on 26 September 1891:

Col. H.S. Olcott handed me the parcel from you, Mr. Neresheimer being present, and as the Col. left the room, & Mr. Neresheimer remained, I put the whole into one of our large linen envelopes, sealed it, and Mr. Neresheimer endorsed it for Mr. Judge & took it at once to his safe. It occurred to me afterwards, that had you been so gracious as to send me a line within the outer envelope addressed to me, I have now to wait till Mr. Judge returns for the contentment of reading it!!"<sup>26</sup>

It is also of record that Colonel Olcott or Mrs. Besant had it in July 1894. The Archivist of the Theosophical Society, Pasadena, California, made a search for any reference in Judge's papers to the return of the Jewel to Mrs. Besant, and reported "for the present... we have no information to send you. 27 No response has been received from Radha Burnier at the Theosophical Society, Adyar, India, regarding anything among Mrs. Besant's or Olcott's papers relating to the return of the Jewel. Perhaps some day a document will be found to clarify this period in the Jewel's chronology.

So, from Judge's or Mrs. Ver Planck's possession, the Jewel came back somehow to Mrs. Besant. C. Jinarajadasa, fourth International President of the Theosophical Society, referred to two paintings of the Cagliostro Jewel:

The first one is painted and signed by John Varley on July 28, 1894, and is witnessed at back “as being a fair representation” by Mrs. Varley and countersigned with Col. Olcott’s signature of the same date. The second painting a week before was painted by Mrs. Isabel Cooper-Oakley and witnessed by H.S. Olcott, G.T. Campbell and A.J. Willson. If H.P.B. gave it to Amma [Mrs. Besant before her death in 1891, it must have been in her possession and she must have lent it to Col. Olcott for the paintings. Furthermore, evidently Col. Olcott was under the impression when he made his will that the jewel was with him in Adyar.<sup>28</sup>

Colonel Olcott’s Will,<sup>29</sup> dated Adyar, 11 January 1907, states:

The Rosicrucian jewel and Master M.’s portrait (painted by Mrs. Jibhart) now loaned to Annie Besant, are to be returned to the curios [sic] at Headquarters after her death.

Jinarajadasa wanted to have a bust made of Mrs. Besant, not when she was old but in the year 1902. He wrote to Rukmini Arundale:

. . . in the year 1902 ... a photograph of her [Besant was taken in Florence by an Italian painter... In this photograph Amma [Besant] is wearing H.P.B.’s Rosicrucian Jewel. You will recall my sending you the part of the Will of Colonel Olcott where he leaves the Jewel to the Society. It is now with you and you said sometime you would return it. I presume Amma herself did not recall this clause in the Colonel’s Will, so that when she made her own Will... she did not mention the jewel... I presume it is locked up with your other jewels ...and if so I would like you to hand the jewel over to me and take a receipt from me. I can then see to the cast being made for the bust and that the jewel is placed in Amma’s safe in her room.”<sup>30</sup>

Mrs Arundale recounted how the Jewel came to her:

And one day, Dr. Besant called Dr. Arundale over to her room and invited me also to come. Then she put this around his neck and said, “I want you to wear this.” Then, next minute she smiled at me and she said, “Of course, it’s also for Rukmini.” She said, “And so she can wear it any time.” So I kept it.”<sup>31</sup>

When Jinarajadasa insisted on her returning it because Colonel Olcott wrote in his Will that the Jewel should go to the Society after his death, Rukmini Arundale said to him:

“How can that be true? Because, here Dr. Besant gave it directly to us, and how could he have said that in his will? And she said H.P.B. gave it. She couldn’t have told an untruth.” And then he looked still further and discovered that this was worn by Dr. Besant before Colonel Olcott died. 1902, and Colonel Olcott died in 1907. So then, he wrote to me saying, “You are quite right. So Colonel Olcott must have made a mistake.” He [Olcott] probably thought, having seen this rare

thing, “You see, we don’t know what will happen. It should go to the Society.” But not meaning that legally it was his property, he must have put it that way.<sup>32</sup>

Rukmini Arundale responded to Jinarajadasa’s letter, saying:

Two years ago I started travelling by aeroplanes, and at the suggestion and with the help of Henry Hotchener I made a will. Knowing the value of the Cagliostro jewel I have left it to the Theosophical Society at my death with many other valuable possessions.”<sup>33</sup>

The fascinating Cagliostro Rosicrucian Jewel no doubt is, or was, a highly magnetized object. Its significance when worn by a person of the 18th Degree may not be so much in the attainment of occult status as in the work the wearer is intended to do. Seven people have possessed it since Cagliostro—HPB, bringer of light; Olcott, spreader of light; Besant, expositor of light; Ver Planck, keeper of light; Judge, counsellor of light; George and Rukmini Arundale, devotee and transformer of light. All these have made significant contributions to the theosophical movement. Whether or not the Cagliostro Jewel is destined to further assist humanity’s evolution remains to be seen.

---

## Notes

\* The author gratefully acknowledges her indebtedness to Joseph E. Ross for the use of his unique archives and for his valuable comments and suggestions during the preparation of this article.

<sup>1</sup> Henry Steel Olcott. *Old Diary Leaves, Fourth Series, 1887–1892*. Vol. IV (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1910), 395.

<sup>2</sup> In the terminology of Masonic and other secret orders, the symbol representing a stage, degree, or function of an office is called a “Jewel,” whether or not it contains one or more precious gems.

<sup>3</sup> Boris de Zirkoff, comp., *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings: Volume I. 1874–1878*. Second ed. (Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House, 1977), 425.

<sup>4</sup> C. Jinarajadasa, *Letters From the Masters of the Wisdom: Second Series*. Transcribed and Annotated by C. Jinarajadasa (Chicago: The Theosophical Press, 1926), 54.

<sup>5</sup> Boris de Zirkoff, comp., *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings: Volume XIV: Miscellaneous*. Compiled by Boris de Zirkoff. Second ed. (Wheaton IL: Theosophical Publishing House, 1985), 59. Also, Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine: The Synthesis of Science, Religion And Philosophy*: Volume 5. Fourth ed. (Adyar, Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1938), 85.

<sup>6</sup> *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings*, XIV: 200. *The Secret Doctrine* V: 201.

<sup>7</sup> Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine: The Synthesis of Science, Religion and Philosophy, Vol. I, Cosmogogenesis* (Pasadena, Theosophical University Press, 1988), facsimile of the original edition, 19. Also, see the Adyar edition, Vol. I, 4th ed. (Adyar, Madras: Theosophical Publishing House 1938), 84.

<sup>8</sup> *The Secret Doctrine* (Pasadena edition), I: 80; Adyar ed., I: 146.

<sup>9</sup> Manly P. Hall, *An Encyclopedic Outline of Masonic, Hermetic, Qabbalistic and Rosicrucian Symbolic Philosophy; Being an interpretation of the secret teachings concealed within the rituals, allegories and mysteries of all ages* (Los Angeles: The Philosophical Research Society, 1977), [Reduced facsimile of 1928 ed.], 39.

<sup>10</sup> Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine: The Synthesis of Science, Religion and Philosophy, Vol. II, Anthropogenesis* (Pasadena, Theosophical University Press, 1988), 54562. Also, Adyar edition, Vol. 4. 4th ed. (Adyar, Madras: Theosophical Publishing House 1938), 115–32.

<sup>11</sup> *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings XIV: 292; The Secret Doctrine*, Adyar ed., V: 293.

<sup>12</sup> Bhagavan Das, trans., *Mystic Experiences Tales of Yoga and Vedanta from the Yoga Vasishtha*. Third ed. (Varanasi. The Indian Bookshop, 1959), 36.

“And for the Science was first given to kings, it has come down under the name of Raja-vidya, Raja-guhya, Science of Kings and King of Sciences, the Royal Secret Doctrine.”

<sup>13</sup> *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings I: 104-5.*

<sup>14</sup> Boris de Zirkoff, comp., *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings: Vol. XII: 1889–1890*. (Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House, 1980), 79. The entire article (78–88) appeared first in *Lucifer*.

<sup>15</sup> *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings: Vol. XII: 81.*

<sup>16</sup> *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings I:161.*

<sup>17</sup> *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings: Vol. I:109.*

<sup>18</sup> *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings I:1 61.*

<sup>19</sup> Rukmini Devi Arundale. Tape-recorded interview. April 8, 1978. Joseph E. Ross private archives.

<sup>20</sup> Annie Besant, *The Case Against W, Q. Judge* (Publ. at the offices of the Theosophical Publishing Society 7, Duke St. Adelphi, W.C., 1895), 14.

<sup>21</sup> Annie Besant, *The Case Against W, Q. Judge*, 23–26.

<sup>22</sup> Annie Besant, *The Case Against W, Q. Judge*, 44–45.



<sup>23</sup> Annie Besant, *The Case Against W. Q. Judge*, 77.

<sup>24</sup> Archives, Theosophical Society (Pasadena).

<sup>25</sup> Letter of Jerome A. Anderson, M.D., "To Whom it May Concern," 18 June 1894, Archives, Theosophical Society (Pasadena).

<sup>26</sup> Letters to Mrs Besant, 23 September and 26 September 1891. Archives, Theosophical Society (Pasadena).

<sup>27</sup> Letter from The Archivist of the Theosophical Society (Pasadena), Kirby Van Mater, 6 March 1990.

<sup>28</sup> Letter from C. Jinarajadasa to Srimati Rukmini Devi Arundale, 2 June 1948. Joseph E. Ross private archives.

<sup>29</sup> Copy of Colonel Olcott's will, dated 11 January 1907, certified by T.S. (Adyar) Treasurer A.J. Hamerster, Adyar, 20 October 1933, that this is a true copy of the original Will and Codicil deposited in the Registry of the High Court at Madras, certified by the 2nd Assistant Register, 24 April 1912. Joseph E. Ross private archives.

<sup>30</sup> Letter from C. Jinarajadasa to Rukmini Devi Arundale, 26 May 1948. Joseph E. Ross private archives.

<sup>31</sup> Arundale, Rukmini Devi. Tape-recorded interview, 8 April 1978. Joseph E. Ross private archives.

<sup>32</sup> Arundale, Rukmini Devi. Tape-recorded interview, 8 April 1978.

<sup>33</sup> Letter from Rukmini Devi Arundale to C. Jinarajadasa, 28 June 1948. Copy in Joseph E. Ross private archives.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Book Reviews

James A. Santucci

**TRUTH IS A PATHLESS LAND: A JOURNEY WITH KRISHNAMURTI.** By Ingram Smith. Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House, 1989. Pp. x + 220: Illustrations, Paper, \$8.25.

**KRISHNAMURTI: THE RELUCTANT MESSIAH.** By Sidney Field. Edited by Peter Hay. New York: Paragon House, 1989. Pp. vii + 157. \$16.95.

Both books are concerned with the authors' acquaintance with one of the most influential philosophers of the twentieth century, Jiddu Krishnamurti (1895–1986): Ingram Smith recalling his association from 1949 to 1983, Sidney Field's from the 1920s to the early 1970s.

Mr. Smith is a noted writer-producer for the Australian Broadcasting Commission; Mr. Field (1905–1988), born into the family largely responsible for establishing the Theosophical Society in Costa Rica, was once a writer for the Walt Disney Studios (California). Despite their differing backgrounds, it is perhaps not surprising that both authors share such a similar opinion of Krishnamurti: one of great admiration to the point of adulation, especially in Mr. Smith's case. The philosopher takes on somewhat of a mythical and mystical quality that perhaps may cause the skeptical reader to wonder whether the accounts are balanced and accurate. They will nonetheless certainly confirm the sentiments of his disciples and admirers. Both books are therefore concerned more with the impact of Krishnamurti on the authors; as such, they are less biographical, less historical, and more contemplative.

Still in all, the general reader will find some insight into the personality and teachings of Krishnamurti. This is especially true of Mr. Smith, who provides snippets of his teaching and teaching method. One drawback of the book in my opinion is the author's raising but never pursuing the question of one of the more perplexing problems of the whole Krishnamurti movement. Why have an organization to perpetuate a teaching when truth, according to Krishnamurti, is considered a pathless land? The question is certainly valid but left completely unanswered; in fact, once raised it is completely ignored. It is almost as puzzling as the classic question raised in Buddhism: what is reborn if the soul is denied. At least an answer is attempted in Buddhism.

Sidney Field, on the other hand, writes less of Krishnamurti's teachings and more on the arena where he, Field, and Krishnamurti were the main actors. The interest in this book rests more with the Field family's relative importance in the theosophical world. We learn, for instance, that his parents and grandparents were in part responsible for establishing the Theosophical Society (Adyar) in Costa Rica and were the first representatives of the Order of the Star in the East. His family was therefore associated with the O.S.E. from the early years, shortly after the discovery of the young boy Krish-

namurti by C. W. Leadbeater and Mrs. Besant as the intended vehicle for the Christ. Mr. Fields' reminiscences of this period (1915 to 1920) of two prominent theosophists and O.S.E. members who happened to become Presidents of Costa Rica—Federico Tinoco and the artist Tomás Povedano de Arcos—the latter once the court painter to Queen Cristina, as well as Krishnamurti's status in the country, are mentioned in passing.

After Costa Rica, the Field family settled in Hollywood in 1925. Krishnamurti's connection with the Hollywood film community is somewhat well known, and this is brought out very well by the book. One amusing story told by him concerns the film actress Luise Rainer's opinion that Krishnamurti would make a great actor because of his looks and personality. Other names prominent in the community who frequented Krishnamurti's Arya Vihara in Ojai, not very far from Hollywood, are also mentioned, most notably Charlie Chaplin, Greta Garbo, Yul Brynner, Angela Lansbury, and John Hustin.

Scattered throughout the book are vignettes and opinions of the prominent players in the Order of the Star and the Theosophical Society, with Krishnamurti's remarks sprinkled here and there, that will surely interest the reader. Also the problems and eventual rupture between Krishnamurti and his longtime business associate and President of Krishnamurti Writings Inc., Rajagopal, are presented in some detail.

Of the two books, Field's is of greater historical interest and will surely appeal to those readers familiar with Krishnamurti's frequent sojourns in Ojai. Smith's book is the more contemplative and certainly more the work of a disciple. Both come up rather short, in my opinion, in giving a critical assessment of Krishnamurti the man and the teacher. Admirers and disciples usually present mythicized and rarified accounts of teachers and spiritual preceptors; seldom is the individual presented with those qualities, admirable and otherwise, that make him more human. Furthermore, one wonders whether the difficulty in grasping many of Krishnamurti's teachings are due more to his inability in getting his ideas across, as was formerly observed in Cyril Scott's *The Initiate in the Dark Cycle*, rather than to his profundity. Whatever one's opinion, we will have to await future studies to provide a more balanced and sober account of this important figure.

## **Review Of Blavatsky and Her Teachers Letter From Mr. Daniel Caldwell PART ONE**

**[Editor's Note:** Mr. Daniel Caldwell, in a letter dated 9 December 1988 to the former editor Leslie Price, gave a lengthy estimation and critique of Jean Overton Fuller's biography of Blavatsky. Herein are reproduced the relative passages from that letter in addition that section of his letter entitled "The Location of the 'Ravine in Tibet'." Miss Fuller's response follows.]

... I have been waiting for more than three years to read *Blavatsky and Her Teachers*. After having now read it, I find this biography exciting and thought-provoking ...

Miss Overton Fuller (hereafter referred to as J.O.F.) has obviously done a great deal of work in researching and writing this biography of H.P.B. She has also made some very significant discoveries. The most outstanding discovery (in my mind) is chapter 58, "The Language of the Coulomb Letters," on pages 148–53. If her discovery holds up under close scrutiny (I believe it will!) then J.O.F. has shown that H.P.B. did not write the "Coulomb letters, at least not the incriminating parts!"

In documenting that Madame Coulomb knew Italian, J.O.F. writes:

In her pamphlet Madame Coulomb obligingly lets slip that they did not go direct from Cairo to Ceylon but went first to Calcutta, where she gave Italian lessons to Lady Temple. (153)

J.O.F. does not give Madame Coulomb's own words or the exact page reference. Readers might like to see Madame Coulomb's own words as found on page 4 of her 1884 pamphlet:

Being strangers in this town [Calcutta], we had a good deal of trouble to find occupation, but finally did. I was employed in a school from 9 A.M. to 3 P.M., and in the spare hours I used to give private lessons, both in French and Italian to several ladies belonging to the elite of the society there. I also had the honour of giving lessons in Italian to Lady Temple, wife of Sir Richard Temple, late Governor of Bombay...

J.O.F. also quotes from Josephine Ransom's *Short History of the Theosophical Society* that Madame Coulomb knew both French and Italian. Ransom's information is derived from the Supplement to *The Theosophist*, June 1881, second page of Supplement where the relevant extract reads:

Assistants to the Corresponding Secretary:... Mme. E. Coulomb, French and Italian...

I found Chapter 68 on “The Medical Certificate” very interesting. In this chapter J.O.F. refutes certain statements made by Marion Meade in her biography [of Madame Blavatsky (1980)].

Appendix I on “The ‘Bolt’ or Dondoukoff-Korsakoff Letters” is guaranteed to provoke controversy among Theosophical and Blavatsky scholars. J.O.F. contends that the 16 letters from H.P.B. to Prince Dondoukoff-Korsakoff are forgeries written by some unknown Russian and palmed off on the Theosophists. It should be noted that both C. Jinarajadasa and Boris de Zirkoff believed these letters were genuine H.P.B. After reading and rereading this appendix, J.O.F.’s arguments have failed to convince me that these particular H.P.B. letters are forgeries ....

Although I have enjoyed reading J.O.F.’s biography, I must add that numerous errors (some trivial, some not so trivial) are to be found in this volume. In the remainder of this letter, I will detail ten mistakes under three headings (I, II, and III).

### I. The Location of the “Ravine in Tibet

In Chapter 12 entitled “Tibet,” pp. 24–27, J.O.F. writes:

Morya lived near the Grand Monastery of Trashi Lhunpo... Trashi Lhunpo, and the little town of Shigatse beneath its walls, are on the River Nyang... about 150 miles west-south west of Lhasa. Morya’s house was in a ravine where a stream was flanked by higher mountains than those at Shigatse. He had arranged that Madame Blavatsky should stay at the house of his friend and colleague Koot Hoomi... Koot Hoomi received at his house young Tibetan chelas... Presumably, they had been sent from Trashi Lhunpo... His house was near enough for them to have ridden there daily from the monastery... Djwal Khool... later... made for Madame Blavatsky a picture of the ravine... on silk, in misty blue, green and silver tones (24).

J.O.F. informs the reader that the “picture of the ravine” shows Master Morya “wearing a white.. .turban... [and]. riding a... horse... He is approaching the steps of his house... Djwal Khool stands in the stream, holding a pole. At bottom right is a tiny temple, typically Tibetan, with two prayer-flags. Out of the picture, we are told, is a bridge leading to Koot Hoomi’s house, off right round a bend.” (24–25)

Where is this “picture of the ravine” preserved? J.O.F.’s text and endnotes provide no answer. The answer (if one is lucky enough to find it!) is on the second page of the illustrations (between pp. 136–37) where the picture in question is reproduced with the caption “The Ravine in Tibet. Morya riding to his house.” See p. 24. Theosophical Society Adyar.

But where does J.O.F. get her information about the picture being on silk “in misty blue, green and silver tones”? The illustration in J.O.F.’s book is in black and white. Did she view the original picture at Adyar or obtain a colored photo from Adyar? Or...?

Furthermore, where does she derive the information that Djwal Khool made the picture? Where did she get the information that Koot Hoomi's house is "out of the picture... off right round a bend?" J.O.F. writes "we are told." By whom? Where is the source? She gives no source in her text or the accompanying endnotes.

I assume that she may be deriving some of her information ("we are told") from C.W. Leadbeater's *The Masters and the Path*, 2nd ed., pp. 16–18.

But even more important is the question: what are J.O.F.'s sources for the statement that the Masters Morya and Koot Hoomi lived in two houses in a ravine in the vicinity of "Trashi Lhunpo and "Shigatse," Tibet? As far as I can ascertain, her endnotes (pp. 243–44) to Chapter 12 do not document the source(s).

Several other Theosophical writers<sup>1</sup> have also claimed that K.H.'s house (or in some versions, his sister's house) where H.P.B. stayed was at or near Shigatse, Tibet. From the primary sources these writers cite, I do not understand how this "claim" was derived. With the appearance of this new H.P.B. biography, I am even more puzzled by J.O.F.'s undocumented assertion that "The Ravine in Tibet" is near Shigatse!

I do not deny the possibility that Morya and Koot Hoomi may have had residences in or around Shigatse. They may even have had residences at "Trashi Lhunpo!" But my research indicates that the "Ravine in Tibet" is located in the vicinity of "Little Tibet, i.e. Ladakh (As the crow flies, Ladakh is more than 600 miles to the northwest of Shigatse. Rudok in western Tibet is approximately 600 miles (northwest) from Shigatse; Leh, Ladakh is about 725 miles (NVV) from Shigatse.)

To support my hypothesis, I submit the following primary source documents:

(a) Letter from H.S. Olcott to A.O. Hume (dated 30 September 1881):<sup>2</sup>

I have also personally known—[Koot Hoomi] since 1875. He is of quite a different, a gentler, type, yet the bosom friend of the other [Morya]. They live near each other with a small Buddhist Temple about midway between their houses.

In New York, I had... a colored sketch on China Silk of the landscape near [Koot Hoomi's] and my Chohan's residences with a glimpse of the latter's house and of part of the little temple.

(b) Letter from H.S. Olcott to Damodar K. Mavalankar (dated 4 October 1880):<sup>3</sup>

. . . the Tibetan temple... you will see the very image of in a coloured painting on silk that lies on my bureau in my bed-room, and that was magically produced by her [H.P.B.] for me in New York one day ....

(c) Article by H.P.B. in reply to Arthur Lillie's criticisms (dated 3 August 1884):<sup>4</sup>

. . . I have lived at different periods in Little Tibet as in Great Tibet... I have stopped in Lamaistic convents... I have visited Tzigadze [Shigatse], the Tashi-Lhunpo [Trashi Lhunpo] territory and its neighbourhood... As to my having been in Tibet, at

Mahatma Koot Hoomi's house, I have better proof in store—when I believe it needed  
....

- (d) Letter from H.P.B. to Franz Hartmann (dated 5 December 1885):<sup>5</sup>

A lake is there, surely, and mountains plenty—if where Master is; if near Tchigadze [Shigatse]—only little hillocks.

- (e) Letter from H.P.B. to Mrs. Mary Hollis Billings (dated 2 October 1881):<sup>6</sup>

Now Morya lives generally with Koot Hoomi who has his house in the direction of the Kara Korum Mountains, beyond Ladak, which is in Little Tibet and belongs now to Kashmire. It is a large wooden building in the Chinese fashion pagoda-like, between a lake and a beautiful mountain ....

- (f) Letter from Damodar K. Mavalankar to William Q. Judge (dated 28 June 1881):<sup>7</sup>

... I was getting out of the body... I saw I was in a peculiar place. It was the upper end of Cashmere at the foot of the Himalayas. I saw I was taken to a place where there were only two houses just opposite to each other and no other sign of habitation. From one of these came out the person... 'Koot Hoomi :.' It was his house. Opposite him stops :. [Morya] Brother K—ordered me to follow him. After going a short distance of about half a mile we came to a natural subterranean passage which is under the Himalayas .... There is a natural causeway on the River Indus which flows underneath in all its fury .... After walking a considerable distance through this subterranean passage we came into an open plain in L—k [Ladakh]. There is a large massive building thousands of years old .... What was that I saw? .... was taken in some mysterious way in my astral body to the real place of Initiation ....

I now give several extracts from *The Mahatma Letters* which possibly relate to K.H.'s house in the vicinity of Ladakh

- (g) Letter III B from K.H. to A.P. Sinnett (dated 20 October 1880):<sup>8</sup>

... the present [note] is...dated... from a Kashmir valley.

- (h) Letter III C from K.H. to A.P. Sinnett (dated 20 October 1880):<sup>9</sup>

your last note... was received in my room [in a Kashmir valley!] about half a minute after the currents for the production of the pillow-dak [involving the brooch No. 2 and Letter III B] had been set ready and in full play. [Underlining added.]

Compare the above-quoted words of K.H. in extracts (g) and (h) with J.O.F.'s comments (178) on Mahatma Letter III B:

. . . Ill B was sent by Koot Hoomi from a Kashmir valley, where presumably he had no paper. He might have used his trip to Amritsar to buy paper, but even if he did, it was probably packed on to his horse and he had perhaps not thought to buy ink and a pen, having these in Tibet.

Contrary to what J.O.F. writes, K.H. could have had not only paper, but pen and ink in his room in the residence located “in a Kashmir Valley.” Furthermore, K.H. did not go to Amritsar until sometime after October 20!

(i) Letter IV from K.H. to A.P. Sinnett (dated 29 October 1880):<sup>10</sup>

. . . the other day... I was coming down the defiles of Kouenlun—Karakorum you call them... I had gone personally to our chief... and was crossing over to Ladakh on my way home.

(j) Letter 49 from K.H. to A.P. Sinnett (dated early August 1881):<sup>11</sup>

Just home... I now come from Sakya-Jong . . . From Ghalarang-Tcho Lamasery..., I crossed to Horpa Pa La territory... and thence—home.

(k) Letter 13 from Morya to A.P. Sinnett (dated January 1882):<sup>12</sup>

. . . the iceberg now before me (in our K.H.’s home)....

Is Morya referring to a glacier (in the mountain/lake area of Ladakh) that he sees as he looks out the window(s) of K.H.’s home?

(l) Letter 22 from K.H. to A.O. Hume:<sup>13</sup>

. . . the lake near which, with my fingers half frozen I now write to you this letter.

Could this be the lake near K.H.’s house (located beyond Ladakh) which is mentioned in several extracts quoted above??

(m) Letter 140 from H.P.B. to A.P. Sinnett (dated 6 January 1886):<sup>14</sup>

. . . I was... in Mah. K.H.’s house. I was sitting in a corner on a mat and he walking about the room in his riding dress... as Master [Morya] was not at home, I took to him [E.K.H.] a few sentences I was studying in Senzar in his sister’s room .... I am bidding goodbye to his sister and her child and all the chelas ....

Is “Mah. K.H.’s house” in the vicinity of “Little Tibet?”



I give two more sources relevant to the subject under discussion:

(n) Comment by Vera Johnston on one of H.P.B.'s letters to her relatives:<sup>15</sup>

She [H.P.B.] had once spent seven weeks in a forest not far from the Karakoram mountains, where she had been isolated from the world, and where her teacher alone had visited her daily, whether astrally or otherwise she did not state. But whilst there she had been shown in a cave-temple a series of statues representing the great teachers of the world ....

(o) Reply by Countess Constance Wachtmeister to a question about H.P.B.'s stay in Tibet:<sup>16</sup>

I cannot tell much about H.P.B.'s stay in Tibet. I only know that she lived there for three years, that she resided in the house of the sister of the Master K.H.... She learned the Tibetan language, and her time was chiefly occupied in reading and writing. There was an extensive library for reference.

If I am mistaken in placing the "Ravine in Tibet" in the vicinity of Ladakh, then how does one reconcile the extracts I have quoted with some better hypothesis about the location of the "Ravine?"

**Daniel Caldwell**

---

### Reference Sources

<sup>1</sup> Boris De Zirkoff, "Helena Petrovna Blavatsky: General Outline of Her Life Prior to Her Public Work," *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings, Vol. I: 1874–1878*. Compiled by Boris de Zirkoff (Wheaton IL: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1966), xlviii; Howard Murphet, *When Daylight Comes* (Wheaton, IL: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1975), 56; H.J. Spierenburg, "Dr. Steiner on H.P. B.," *Theosophical History*, Vol. I, No. 7 (July 1986): 168–69.

<sup>2</sup> Anonymous, *Hints on Esoteric Theosophy*, No. I. First ed. (Calcutta: Calcutta Central Press Co., April 1882), 83.

<sup>3</sup> *Damodar and the Pioneers of the Theosophical Movement*. Compiled and annotated by Sven Eek. First ed. (Adyar: Theosophical Publishing House, 1965), 158.

<sup>4</sup> Boris de Zirkoff, comp., *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings, Vol. VI: 1883–1884–1885*. Compiled by Boris de Zirkoff (Los Angeles: Blavatsky Writings Publication Fund, 1954), 272, 274.

<sup>5</sup> “Letters of H.P.B. to Dr. Hartmann,” *The Path* (January 1896): 299.

<sup>6</sup> *The Theosophical Forum* (Point Loma, CA), Vol. 8, No. 5 (May, 1936): 345.

<sup>7</sup> *Damodar and the Pioneers of The Theosophical Movement*: 60–62.

<sup>8</sup> *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*. Transcribed, compiled, and with an introduction by A. Trevor Barker. 2nd ed. (Point Loma: Theosophical University Press, 1926), 11. Same page in 3rd ed. (edited by Christmas Humphreys and Elsie Benjamin. (Adyar: Theosophical Publishing House, 1962).

<sup>9</sup> *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*.

<sup>10</sup> *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, 12.

<sup>11</sup> *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, 280, 284, 286: 3rd ed., 276, 280, 282.

<sup>12</sup> *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, 73; 3rd ed., 72.

<sup>13</sup> *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, 140; 3rd ed., 137.

<sup>14</sup> *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, 478–79; 3rd ed., 471.

<sup>15</sup> “The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky. II,” *The Path* (January 1895): 299.

<sup>16</sup> *The Theosophical Forum* (New York, NY), no. 59 (May 1894): 12.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **The Ravine In Tibet: A Reply To Mr. Caldwell**

**Jean Overton Fuller**

The picture is at Adyar. The information that it was on silk, in misty, blue, green and silver tones was given to me in the letter which accompanied the black and white print of "A Ravine" in Tibet and conveyed the permission of Adyar to reproduce it. Note that it was referred to as "A Ravine in Tibet", not "A Ravine in Ladakh or Kashmir". It is true that I somewhat reserved my references at this point, because it seemed to me unfair to burden the particular member of the staff at Adyar with the responsibility for what I felt sure was simply the orthodox tradition of Adyar. It would have come to Adyar with the rest of Olcott's things, on his death. They may have no precise statement in his hand with regard to details of and concerning this picture, because he would have told them by word of mouth while he was alive. It was defined to me in the letter as having been precipitated by Djwal Khool. I took from Leadbeater's *The Masters and the Path* that the house of Koot Hoomi and the spot where Madame Blavatsky was accustomed to bathe were round the corner to the right, trusting that he was here relaying simply the Adyar tradition. That the temple in the bottom right-hand corner, with a Chinese style roof, is flying two Tibetan prayer-flags is simply a fact of my own observation. Nobody pointed it out to me. It can be seen, on inspection of the print. That the architecture of Morya's house is not Tibetan but could be Nepalese, is also my own observation. As to the letter from Madame Blavatsky to Mrs. Billing, I would be interested to see a copy. The references to Kashmir and Ladakh in *The Mahatma Letters* are naturally familiar to me, but did not seem to me to prove the Masters lived there. They travelled about. In one letter, Koot Hoomi mentions that he is in Pari Jong. That is in Tibet, on Younghusband's 1904 route. I was aware also of the slight differentiation made by Madame Blavatsky in her letter to Hartmann between Shigatse, where there were only hillocks, and where Morya was, where there were mountains. Shigatse is at the bottom of a small hill, but it was never said the Masters lived in Shigatse. I considered them as living nearer to Trashi Lhünpo, or to the Panchen's private residence. The latter seemed to me the more likely in view of what Mrs. Cleather understood from the Panchen who succeeded him; and he said his predecessor had known Madame Blavatsky very well. This would hardly have been the case unless she had been staying pretty near him. It surprises me that Mr. Caldwell's letter makes no reference to Mrs. Cleather's book.

If the school was in Ladakh or Kashmir, why should Morya, after he moved to it, have forsaken his white turban and put "a yellow saucer" on his head, as Koot Hoomi did? This was obviously a courtesy to the Panchen, as a great personage of the Gelukpa

or Yellow Hats. The Masters were not monks. Yellow Hats would, however, be suitable to their status as guests of the Panchen donned by them in that tradition of courtesy that impels our Queen to put on a slit skirt when a guest in Thailand and a small veil when a guest of Muslims, and the Princess of Wales to put on a severe, dark blue, tunic-like looking dress to visit the police at Scotland Yard, or saucy white sailor-style hat to visit an Italian naval port.

\* \* \* \* \*