

## Theories About Reincarnation and Spirits by H.P. Blavatsky

From The Path, November, 1886

Published in 1930

Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Chennai [Madras] India  
The Theosophist Office, Adyar, Madras. India

OVER and over again the abstruse and mooted question of Rebirth or Reincarnation has crept out during the first ten years of the Theosophical Society's existence. It has been alleged on *prima facie* evidence, that a notable discrepancy was found between statements made in *Isis Unveiled*, Volume I, pp. 351-2, and later teachings from the same pen and under the inspiration of the same Master. [ See charge and answer, in *Theosophist*. August 1882]

In *Isis* it was held, reincarnation is denied. An occasional return, only of "depraved spirits" is allowed. ' Exclusive of that rare and doubtful possibility, *Isis* allows only three cases - abortion, very early death, and idiocy - in which reincarnation on this earth occurs." ("C. C. M." in *Light*, 1882.)

The charge was answered then and there as every one who will turn to the *Theosophist* of August, 1882, can see for himself. Nevertheless, the answer either failed to satisfy some readers or passed unnoticed. Leaving aside the strangeness of the assertion that *reincarnation* - i.e., the serial and periodical rebirth of every individual *monad* from *pralaya to pralaya* - [The cycle of existence during the *manvantara* - period before and after the beginning and completion of which every such "Monad" is absorbed and reabsorbed in the ONE soul, *anima mundi*. ] is denied in the face of the fact that the doctrine is part and parcel and one of the fundamental features of Hinduism and Buddhism, the charge amounted virtually to this: the writer of the present, a professed admirer and student of Hindu philosophy, and as professed a follower of Buddhism years before *Isis* was written, by rejecting reincarnation must necessarily reject Karma likewise! For the latter is the very *corner* stone of Esoteric philosophy and Eastern Religions; it is the grand and one pillar *on which hangs the whole philosophy of rebirths*, and once the latter is denied, the whole doctrine of Karma falls into meaningless verbiage.

Nevertheless, the opponents without stopping to think of the evident "discrepancy" between charge and fact, accused a Buddhist by profession of faith of denying reincarnation, hence also by implication - Karma. Adverse to wrangling with one who was a friend, and undesirous at the time, to enter upon a defence of details and internal evidence - a loss of time indeed - the writer answered merely with a few sentences. But it now becomes necessary to well define the doctrine. Other critics have taken the same line, and by misunderstanding the passages to that effect in *Isis* they have reached the same rather extraordinary conclusions.

To put an end to such useless controversies, it is proposed to explain the doctrine more clearly.

Although, in view of the later more minute renderings of the esoteric doctrines, it is quite immaterial what may have been written in *Isis* - an encyclopedia of occult subjects in which each of those is *hardly*

*sketched* - let it be known at once, that the writer maintains the correctness of every word given out upon the subject in my earlier volumes. What was said in the *Theosophist* of August, 1882, may now be repeated here. The passage quoted from it may be, and is, most likely incomplete, chaotic, vague, perhaps clumsy, as are many more passages in that work, the first literary production of a foreigner who even now can hardly boast of her knowledge of the English language". Nevertheless it is quite correct so far as that collateral feature of reincarnation is therein concerned.

I will now give extracts from *Isis* and proceed to explain every passage criticized, wherein it was said that "a few *fragments* of this mysterious doctrine of reincarnation *as distinct from* metempsychosis" - would be then presented. Sentences now explained are in italics.

"Reincarnation, *i.e.*, the appearance of the same individual, or rather of his *astral monad*, *twice on the same planet* is not a rule in nature, it is an exception, like the teratological phenomenon of a two-headed infant. It is preceded by a *violation of the laws of harmony of nature*, and happens only when the latter *seeking to restore its disturbed equilibrium, violently throws back into earth-life the astral monad which had been tossed out of the circle of necessity by crime or accident*. Thus in cases of abortion, of infants dying before a certain age, and of congenital and incurable idiocy, nature's original design to produce a perfect human being, has been interrupted. Therefore, while the gross matter of each of those several entities is suffered to disperse itself at death, through the vast realm of being, *the immortal spirit and astral monad of the individual - the latter having been set apart to animate a frame and the former to shed its divine light on the corporeal organization - must try a second time to carry out the purpose of the creative intelligence*. (Volume I, page 351.)

Here the "astral monad" or body of the deceased personality - say of John or Thomas - is meant. It is that which, in the teachings of the Esoteric philosophy of Hinduism, is known under its name of *bhoot*; in the Greek philosophy is called the *simulacrum* or *umbra*, and in all other philosophies worthy of the name is said, as taught in the former, to disappear after a certain period more or less prolonged in *Kama-loka* - the Limbus of the Roman Catholic, or *Hades* of the Greeks. [Hades has surely never been meant for *Hell*. It was always the abode of the sorrowing shadows of astral bodies of the dead personalities. Western readers should remember *Kama-loka* is not *karma-loka*, for *Kama* means *desire*, and *Karma* does not. ] It is "a violation of the laws of harmony of nature", though it be so decreed by those of *Karma* - every time that the astral monad, or the *simulacrum* of the personality - of John or Thomas - instead of running down to the end of its natural period of time in a body - finds itself (a) violently thrown out of it by whether early death or accident; or (b) is compelled in consequence of its unfinished task to re-appear, (*i.e.*, *the same astral body wedded to the same immortal monad*) on earth again, in order to complete the unfinished task. Thus "it must try a second time to carry out the purpose of creative intelligence" or *law*".

"If reason has been so far developed as to become active and discriminative there is no [Had this word "immediate" been put at the time of publishing *Isis* between the two words "no" and "reincarnation" there would have been less room for dispute and controversy] (*immediate*) *reincarnation* on this earth, for the three parts of the triune man have been united together, and he is capable of running the race. But when the new being has not passed beyond the condition of Monad, or when, as in the idiot, the trinity has not been completed on earth and therefore cannot be so after death, the immortal spark which illuminates it, has to re-enter on the earthly plane as it was frustrated in its first attempt. Otherwise, the mortal or astral, and the immortal or divine souls, *could not progress in unison and pass onwards to the sphere above* [By "sphere above", of course "Devachan" was meant. ] (*Devachan*). Spirit follows a line

parallel with that of matter; and the spiritual evolution goes hand in hand with the physical".

The occult Doctrine teaches that

(1) There is no *immediate* reincarnation on Earth for the Monad, as falsely taught by the Reincarnationist Spiritists; nor is there any second incarnation at all for the *personal* or *false Ego* - *the perispit* - save the exceptional cases mentioned. But that (a) there are rebirths or periodical reincarnations for the immortal Ego - " Ego" during the cycle of rebirths, and *non-Ego*, in Nirvana or Moksha when it becomes *impersonal* and *absolute*); for that Ego is the root of every new incarnation, the string on which are threaded, one after the other, the false personalities or illusive bodies called men, in which the Monad-Ego incarnates itself during the cycle of births ; and (b) that such reincarnations take place not before 1,500, 2,000, and even 3,000 years of Devachanic life.

(2) That Manas - the seat of *Jiv*, that spark which runs the round of the cycle of birth and rebirths with the Monad, from the beginning to the end of a Manvantara - is the real *Ego*. That (a) the *Jiv* follows the divine monad that gives it spiritual life and immortality into Devachan - that therefore, it can neither be reborn before its appointed period, nor reappear on Earth *visibly* or *invisibly* in the *interim*; and (b) that, unless the fruition, the spiritual aroma of the Manas - or all these highest aspirations and spiritual qualities and attributes that constitute the higher *Self* of man become united to its monad, the latter becomes as *Non-existent*; since it is in esse "impersonal" and *per se* Egoless, so to say, and gets its spiritual colouring or flavour of Ego-tism only from each *Manas* during incarnation and after it is disembodied, and separated from all its lower principles.

(3) That the remaining four principles, or rather the 2-1/2 - as they are composed of the terrestrial portion of *Manas*, of its vehicle *Kama-Rupa* and *Linga Sarira* - the body dissolving immediately, and *prana* or the life principle along with it - that these principles having belonged to the *false* personality are unfit for Devachan. The latter is the state of Bliss, the reward for all the undeserved miseries of life, [The reader must bear in mind that the esoteric teaching maintains that save in cases of wickedness when man's nature attains the acme of Evil, and human terrestrial sin reaches *satanic* universal character, so to say, as *some Sorcerers do* - there is no punishment for the majority of mankind after death. The law of retribution as *Karma*, waits man at the threshold of his new incarnation. Man is at host a wretched tool of evil, unceasingly forming new causes and circumstances. He is not always (if ever) responsible. Hence a period of rest and bliss in Devachan, with an utter temporary oblivion of all the miseries and sorrows of life. *Avitchi* is a *spiritual state* of the greatest misery and is only in store for those who have devoted *consciously* their lives to doing injury to others and have thus reached its highest spirituality of Evil. ] and that which prompted man to sin, namely his terrestrial passionate nature can have no room in it.

Therefore the reincarnating principles are left behind in *Kama-loka*, firstly as a material residue, then later on as a reflection on the mirror of Astral light. Endowed with *illusive* action, to the day when having gradually faded out they disappear, what is it but the Greek Eidolon and the simulacrum of the Greek and Latin poets and classics ?

"What reward or punishment can there be in that sphere of disembodied human entities for a foetus or a human embryo which had not even time to breathe on this earth, still less an opportunity to exercise the divine faculties of its spirit ? Or, for an irresponsible infant, whose senseless monad remaining dormant

within the astral and physical casket, could as little prevent him from burning himself as any other person to death ? Or again for one idiotic from birth, the number of whose cerebral circumvolutions is only from twenty to thirty per cent, of those of sane persons, and who therefore is irresponsible for either his disposition, acts, or for the imperfections of his vagrant, half-developed intellect." (*Isis*, Volume I, page 352.)

These are then, the "exceptions" spoken of in *Isis*, and the doctrine is maintained now as it was then. Moreover, there is no "discrepancy" but only *incompleteness* - hence, misconceptions arising from later teachings. Then again, there are several important mistakes in *Isis* which, as the plates of the work had been *stereotyped* were not corrected in subsequent editions. -

One of such is on page 346, and another in connection with it and as a sequence on page 347.

The discrepancy between the first portion of the statement and the last, ought to have suggested the idea of an evident mistake. It is addressed to the spiritists, *reincarnationists* who take the more than ambiguous words of Apuleius as a passage that corroborates their claims for their "spirits" and reincarnation. Let the reader judge [Says Apuleius: "The soul is born in this world upon leaving the soul of the world (anima mundi) in which her existence precedes the one we all know (on earth). Thus, the Gods, who consider her proceedings in all the phases of various existences as a whole, punish her sometimes for sins committed during an *anterior life*. *She dies* when she separates herself from a body in which she crossed this life in a frail bark. And this is, if I mistake not, the secret meaning of the tumulary inscription, so simple for the initiate: *To the Gods manes who lived*. But this kind of death does not annihilate the soul, it only transforms (one portion of it) into a lemure. Lemures are the *manes*, or ghosts, which we know under the name *lares*. When they keep away and *show us a beneficent protection*, we honour in them the protecting divinities of the family hearth; but if their crimes sentence them to err, we call them *larvae*. They become a plague for the wicked, and the vain terror of the good". ("Du Dieu de Socrate" Apul class, pp. 143-145.) ] whether Apuleius does not justify rather *our* assertions. We are charged with denying reincarnation and this is what we said there and then in *Isis*!

"The *philosophy* teaches that nature *never leaves her work unfinished; if baffled at the first attempt, she tries again*. When she evolves a human embryo, the intention is that a man shall be perfected -physically, intellectually, and spiritually. His body is to grow, mature, wear out, and die ; his mind unfold, ripen, and be harmoniously balanced; his divine spirit illuminate and blend easily with the inner man. No human being completes its grand cycle, or the "circle of necessity", until all these are accomplished. As the laggards in a race struggle and plod in their first quarter while the victor darts past the goal, so, in the race of immortality, some souls outspeed all the rest and reach the end, while their myriad competitors are toiling under the load of matter, close to the starting point. Some unfortunates fall out entirely and lose all chance of the prize ; some retrace their steps and begin again".

Clear enough this, one should say. Nature baffled *tries again*. No one can pass out of this world, (our earth) without becoming perfected *physically, morally, and spiritually*. How can this be done, unless there is *a series of rebirths* required for the necessary perfection in each department - to evolve in the "circle of necessity", can surely never be found in one human life ? and yet this sentence is followed without any break by the following parenthetical statement: "This is what the Hindu dreads above all things - *transmigration* and *reincarnation* ; only on other and inferior planets, never on this one !!!

The last "sentence" is a fatal mistake and one to which the writer pleads *not guilty*. It is evidently the blunder of some "reader" who had no idea of Hindu philosophy and who was led into a subsequent mistake on the next page, wherein the unfortunate word "planet" is put for *cycle*. *Isis* was hardly, if ever, looked into after its publication by its writer, who had other work to do; otherwise there would have been an apology and a page pointing to the *errata* and the sentence made to run: "The Hindu dreads transmigration in other *inferior* forms, on this planet".

This would have dove-tailed with the preceding sentence, and would show a fact, as the Hindu *exoteric* views allow him to believe and fear the possibility of reincarnation - human and animal in turn by jumps, from man to beast and even a plant - and *vice versa*; whereas *esoteric* philosophy teaches that nature never proceeded backward in her evolutionary progress, once that man has evolved from every kind of lower forms - the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms - into the human form, he can never become an animal except morally, hence - *metaphorically*. Human incarnation is a cyclic necessity, and law; and no Hindu dreads it - however much he may deplore the necessity. And this law and the periodical recurrence of man's rebirth is shown on the same page (346) and in the same unbroken paragraph, where it is closed by saying that

"But there is a way to avoid it. Buddha taught it in his doctrine of poverty, restriction of the senses, perfect indifference to the objects of this earthly vale of tears, freedom from passion, and frequent intercommunication with the Atma - soul-contemplation. *The cause of reincarnation is ignorance* ["The cause of reincarnation is ignorance" - therefore there is "reincarnation" once the writer explained the causes of it. ] *of our senses, and the idea that there is any reality in the world, anything except abstract existence*. From the organs of sense comes the 'hallucination' we call contact; 'from contact, desire; from desire sensation (which also is a deception of our body), from sensation, the cleaving to existing bodies; from this cleaving, reproduction; and from reproduction, disease, decay, and death."

This ought to settle the question and show there must have been some carelessly unnoticed mistake and if this is not sufficient, there is something else to demonstrate it, for it is further on:

"Thus, like the revolutions of a wheel, *there is a regular succession of death and birth*, the moral cause of which is the cleaving to existing objects, while the instrumental cause is *Karma*, (the power which controls the universe, prompting it to activity), merit and demerit. It is therefore the great desire of all beings who would be *released from the sorrows of successive birth*, to seek the destruction of the moral cause, the cleaving to existing objects, or evil desire".

"They in whom evil desire is entirely destroyed are called *Arhats*. Freedom from evil desire insures the possession of a *miraculous* power. At his death, the Arhat is never reincarnated; he invariably attains nirvana - a word, by the by, falsely interpreted by the Christian scholar and skeptical commentators. Nirvana is the world of *cause*, in which all deceptive effects or delusions of our senses disappear. Nirvana is the highest attainable sphere. The *pitris* (the pre-Adamic spirits) are considered as reincarnated by the Buddhist philosopher, though in a degree far superior to that of the man of earth. Do they not die in their turn ? Do not their astral bodies suffer and rejoice, and feel the same curse of illusionary feelings as when embodied ? "

And just after this we are again made to say of Buddha and his doctrine of "Merit and Demerit, or Karma :

"But this *former life* believed in by the Buddhists, is not a life on *this planet* for, more than any other people, the Buddhistical philosopher appreciated the great doctrine of cycles."

Correct "life on this planet" by "life in the same cycle," and you will have the correct reading: for what would have appreciation of " the great doctrine of cycles " to do with Buddha's philosophy, had the great sage believed in but one short life on this Earth and in the same cycle. But to return to the real theory of reincarnation as in the esoteric teaching and its unlucky rendering in *Isis*.

Thus, what was really meant therein, was that, the principle which *does not reincarnate* - save the exceptions pointed out - is the false personality, the illusive human Entity defined and individualized; during this short life of ours, under some specific form and name; but that which *does* and has to reincarnate *nolens volens* under the unflinching, stern rule of Karmic law - is the real Ego. This confusion of the real immortal Ego in man, with the false and ephemeral *personalities* it inhabits during its Manvantaric progress, lies at the root of every such misunderstanding. Now what is the one, and what is the other ? The first group is -

1. The immortal Spirit - sexless, formless (arupa) an emanation from the One Universal Breath.

2. Its Vehicle - the *divine* Soul - called the " Immortal Ego," the " Divine Monad" etc., etc., which by accretions from *Manas* in which burns the ever-existing *Jiv* -the undying spark -adds to itself at the close of each incarnation the essence of that individuality *that was*, the aroma of the culled flower that is no more.

What is the *false* personality? It is that bundle of desires, aspirations, affection, and hatred, in short of *action*, manifested by a human being on this earth during one incarnation and under the form of one personality.[A proof how our Theosophical teachings have taken root in every class of Society and oven in English literature may be seen by reading Mr. Norman Pearson's article " Before Birth" in the *Nineteenth Century* for August, 1886. Therein, Theosophical ideas and teachings are speculated upon without acknowledgment or the smallest reference to Theosophy, and among others, we see with regard to the author's theories on the *Ego*, the following: " How much of the *individual personality* is supposed to go to heaven or hell? Does the whole of the mental equipment, good and bad, noble qualities and unholy passions, follow the soul to its hereafter ? surely not. But if not, and something has to be stripped off, how and when are we to draw the line? If, on the other hand, the Soul is something distinct from all our mental equipment, except the sense of self, are we not confronted by the incomprehensible notion of a personality without any attributes?

To this query the author answers as any true Theosophist would: " The difficulties of the question really spring from a misconception of the true nature of these attributes. The components of our mental equipment - appetites, aversions, feelings, tastes and qualities generally - are not absolute but relative existences. Hunger and thirst for instance are states of consciousness which arise in response to the

stimuli of physical necessities. They are not inherent elements of the soul and *will disappear* or become modified, etc." (pp. 356 and 357). In other words, the Theosophical doctrine is adopted, Atma and Buddhi having culled off the *Manas* the aroma of the personality or *human soul* - go into Devachan; while the lower principles, the astral *simulacrum* or false personality, void of its Divine monad or spirit will remain in the *Kama-loka* - the "Summerland". ] Certainly it is not all *this* which as a fact for us, the deluded, material, and materially thinking lot - is Mr. So and So, or Mrs. Somebody else - that remains immortal, or is ever reborn.

All that bundle of *Egotism* that apparent and evanescent "I" disappears after death, as the costume of the part he played disappears from the actor's body, after he leaves the theatre and goes to bed. That actor rebecomes the same "John Smith" or Gray, he was from his birth and is no longer the Othello or Hamlet that he had represented for a few hours. Nothing remains now of that "bundle" to go to the next incarnation, except *the seed for future Karma* that *Manas* may have united to its immortal group, to form with it - the disembodied *Higher Self* in "Devachan". As to the four lower principles, that which becomes of them is found in most classics, from which we mean to quote at length for our defence. The doctrine of the *perisprit* the "false personality" or the remains of the deceased under their astral form-fading out to disappear in time, is terribly distasteful to the spiritualists, who insist upon confusing the temporary with the immortal Ego.

Unfortunately for them and happily for us, it is not the modern Occultists who have invented the doctrine. They are on their defence. And they prove what they say, *i.e.*, that no *personality* has ever yet been "reincarnated" " " on the same planet" (*our earth*, this once there is *no* mistake), save in the three exceptional cases above cited. Adding to these a fourth case, *which is the deliberate, conscious act of adeptship*; and that such an *astral* body belongs *neither to the body nor the soul* still less to the immortal spirit of man, the following is brought forward and proofs cited.

Before one brings out on the strength of undeniable manifestations, theories as to what produces them and claims at once on *prima facie* evidence that it is the *spirits* of the departed mortals that revisit us, it behooves one first to study what antiquity has declared on the subject. Ghosts and apparitions, materialized and semi-material "Spirits" have not originated with Allan Kardec, nor at Rochester. If those beings whose invariable habit is to give themselves out for *souls* and the phantoms of the dead, choose to do so and succeed, it is only because the cautious philosophy, of old is now replaced by an *a priori* conceit, and unproven assumptions. The first question is to be settled - "Have spirits any kind of substance to clothe themselves with?" *Answer*: That which is now called *perisprit* in France, and a "materialized Form" in England and America, was called in days of old *peri-psyche*, and *peri-nous* hence was well known to the old Greeks. Have they a body whether gaseous, fluidic, etherial, material, or semi-material? No; we say this on the authority of the occult teachings the world over. For with the Hindus *atma* or *spirit* is Arupa (bodiless), and with the Greeks also. Even in the Roman Catholic Church the angels of Light as those of Darkness *are absolutely incorporeal*: "*meri spiritus, omnes corporis expertes*" and in the words of the Secret Doctrine, *primordial*. Emanations of the undifferentiated Principle, the Dhyān Chohans of the one (First) category or Pure Spiritual Essence, are formed of the *Spirit of the one Element*; the second category of the second Emanation of the Soul of the Elements; the third have a "*mind body*" to which they are not subject, but that they can assume and govern as a body, subject to *them*, pliant to their will in form and substance. Parting from this (third) category, they (the spirits, angels, Devas or Dhyān Chohans) have Bodies the *first rupa* group of which is composed of one element *Ether* the second, of two - Ether and fire; the third, of three - Ether, fire, and water; the fourth, of four - Ether,

air, fire, and water. Then comes man, who, besides the four elements, has the fifth that predominates in him - Earth therefore he suffers. Of the Angels, as said by St. Augustine and Peter Lombard, their bodies are made *to act* not to suffer. It is earth and water, *humor et humus* that gives an aptitude for suffering and passivity, *ad patientiam*, and *Ether* and *Fire* for action. The spirits or human *monads*, belonging to the first, or undifferentiated essence are thus incorporeal; but their third principle (or the human Fifth - *Manas*) can in conjunction with its vehicle become *Kama rupa* and *Mayavi rupa* - body of desire or "illusion body". After death, the best, noblest, purest qualities of *Manas* or the *human* soul ascending along with the divine *Monad* into "Devachan whence no one emerges from or returns, except at the time of reincarnation - what is that then which appears under the double mask of the spiritual *Ego* or soul of the departed individual? *The Kama rupa element with the help of elementals*. For we are taught that those spiritual beings that can assume a form at will and appear, *i.e.*, make themselves objective and even tangible - are the angels alone (the *Dhyan Chohans*) and the *nirmanakaya*, [*Nirmanakaya* is the name given to the astral forms (*in their completeness*) of adepts, who have progressed too high on the *path of knowledge* and absolute truth, to go into the state of Devachan; and have on the other hand, deliberately refused the bliss of nirvana, in order to help Humanity by invisibly guiding and helping on the same path of progress elect men, But these *astrals* are not empty shells, but complete monads made up of the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th principles. There is another order of *nirmanakaya*, however, of which much will be said in the *Secret Doctrine*. - H. P. B. ] of the adepts, whose spirits are clothed in sublime matter. The astral bodies - the *remnants* and *dregs* of a mortal being which has been disembodied, when they do appear, are not the individuals they claim to be, but only their simulachres. And such was the belief of the whole of antiquity, from Homer to Swedenborg; from the *third* race down to our own day.

More than one devoted spiritualist has hitherto quoted Paul as corroborating his claims that spirits do and can appear. "There is a natural and there is a spiritual body," etc., etc. (*I, Cor.*, xv, 44); but one has only to study closer the verses preceding and following the one quoted, to perceive that what St. Paul meant was quite different from the sense claimed for it. Surely there is a *spiritual* body, but it is not identical with the *astral* form contained in the "natural" man. The "spiritual" is formed only by our individuality *unclothed* and *transformed after death*; for the apostle takes care to explain in Verses 51 and 52, "*Immutabitur sed non omnes*" Behold, I tell you a *mystery*; we shall *not all sleep* but we *shall all be changed*. This corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality.

But this is no proof except for the Christians. Let us see what the old Egyptians and the Neo-Platonists - both "*theurgists*" *par excellence*, thought on the subject. They divided man into three principal groups subdivided into principles as we do: pure immortal spirit, the "Spectral Soul" (*a luminous phantom*) and the gross material body. Apart from the latter which was considered as the terrestrial shell, these groups were divided into six principles: (1) *Kha* "vital body"; (2) *Khaba* "astral form," or shadow; (3) *Khou* "animal soul"; (4) *Akh* "terrestrial intelligence"; (5) *Sa* "the divine soul" (*or Buddhi*); and (6) *Sah* or mummy, the functions of which began after death. *Osiris* was the highest uncreated spirit, for it was, in one sense a generic name, every man becoming after his translation *Osirified*, *i.e.*, absorbed into *Osiris - Sun* or into the glorious divine state. It was *Khou* with the lower portions of *Akh* or *Kama rupa* with the addition of the *dregs* of *Manas* remaining all behind in the astral light of our atmosphere - that formed the counterparts of the terrible and so much dreaded bhoot of the Hindus (our "elementaries"). This is seen in the rendering made of the so-called "Harris, Papyrus on magic" (*papyrus magique*, translated by Chabas), who calls them *Kouey* or *Khou*, and explains that according to the hieroglyphics they were called *Khou* or the "revivified dead," the "resurrected shadows" [Placing those parallel with the division in esoteric teaching we see that (1) *Osiris* is *Atma*; (2) *Sa* is *Buddhi*; (3) *Akh* is *Manas*; (4) *Khou* is *Kama rupa*, the seat of the terrestrial desires; (5) *Khaba* is *Lingha Sarira*; (6) *Kha* is *Pranatma* (vital principle);



(7) *Sah* is mummy or body. ]

When it was said of a person that he *had a Khou*, it meant that he was possessed by a "Spirit". There were two kinds of *Khous* - the justified ones - who after living for a short time a *second life (nam onh)* faded out, disappeared ; and those *Khous* who were condemned to wandering without rest in darkness after *dying for a second time - mut, em, nam* - and who were called the H'ou - *mètre* ("second time dead") which did not prevent them from clinging to a vicarious life after the manner of Vampires. How dreaded they were is explained in our Appendices on Egyptian Magic and " Chinese Spirits" (*Secret Doctrine*). They were exorcised by Egyptian priests as the evil spirit is exorcised by the Roman Catholic curé; or again the Chinese *houen*, identical with the *Khou* and the " Elementary," as also with the *lares* or *larvae* - a word derived from the former by Festus, the grammarian; who explains that they were " the shadows of the dead *who gave no rest in the house they were in* either to the Masters or the servants". These creatures when evoked during theurgic, and especially *necromantic* rites, were regarded, and are regarded so still, in China - as neither the Spirit, nor any thing belonging to the deceased personality they represented, but simply, as his reflection - *simmulacrum*.

"The human soul says Apuleius, " is an *immortal God*" (Buddhi) which nevertheless has his beginning. When death rids it (the Soul), from its earthly corporeal organism, it is called *lemure*. There are among the latter not a few who are beneficent, and which become the gods or demons of the family, *i.e.*, its domestic gods: - in which case they are called *lares*. But they are vilified and spoken of as *larvae* when sentenced by fate to wander about, they spread around them evil and plagues (*Inane terriculamentum, ceterum noxium malis;*) or if their real nature is doubtful they are referred to as simply *manes* (Apuleius, see - *Du Dieu de Socrate*, pages. 143 - 145. Edit. Niz.) Listen to Yamblichus, Proclus, Porphyry, Psellus, and to dozens of other writers on these mystic subjects.

The Magi of Chaldea believed and *taught that the celestial or divine soul* would participate in the bliss of eternal light, while the animal or *sensuous* soul would, if good, rapidly dissolve, and if wicked, go on wandering about in the Earth's sphere. In this case, " it (the soul) assumes at times the forms of various human phantoms and even those of animals ". The same was said of the *Eidolon* of the Greeks, and of their *Nephesh* by the Rabbins: (see *Sciences Occultes*, Count de Resie, V, 11). All the *Illuminati* of the middle ages tell us of our *astral Soul*, the reflection of the dead or his *spectre*. At *Natal* death (birth) the pure spirit remains attached to the *intermediate* and *luminous* body but as soon as its lower form (the physical body) is dead, the former ascends heavenward, and the latter descends into the nether worlds, or the *Kama loka*.

Homer shows us the body of Patroclus - the true image of the terrestrial body lying killed by Hector - rising in its spiritual form, and Lucretius shows old Ennius representing Homer himself, shedding bitter tears, amidst the *shadows and the human simulachres* on the shores of Acherusia *where live neither our bodies nor our souls*, but only our images.

" *Esse Acherusia templa,  
Quo neque permanent animoe, neque corpora nostra,  
Sed queedam simulacra*

Virgil called it *imago* "image" and in the *Odyssey* (I, xi), the author refers to it as the type, the model, and

at the same time the copy of the body ; since Telamachus will not recognize Ulyssus and seeks to drive him off by saying - " No thou art not my father; thou art a demon trying to seduce me!" (*Odys* I, xvi, v. 194.) "Latins do not lack significant proper names to designate the varieties of their demons ; and thus they called them in turn, *lares*, *lemures*, *geni* and *manes*." Cicero, in translating Plato's *Timaeus* translates the word *daimones* by *lares*; and Festus the grammarian, explains that the inferior or lower gods were the *souls of men*, making a difference between the two as Homer did, and between *anima bruta*, and *anima divina* (animal and divine souls). Plutarch (in *proble. Rom.*) makes the lares preside and inhabit the (haunted) houses, and calls them, cruel, exacting, inquisitive, etc., etc. Festus thinks that there are good and bad ones among the lares. For he calls them at one time *proestites* as they gave occasionally, and watched over things care-fully (*direct apports*), and at another - *hostilens*? "[Because they drove the enemies away. ] However it may be," says in his queer old French, Leloyer, " they are no better than our devils, who, if they do appear helping sometimes men, and presenting them with property, it is only to hurt them the better and the more later on. *Lemures* are also devils and *larvae* for they appear at night in various human and animal forms, but still more frequently with features that *they borrow from dead men*." (*Livre des Spectres*, V. iv, pp. 15 and 16.)

After this little honour rendered to his Christian preconceptions, that see Satan everywhere, Leloyer speaks like an Occultist, and a very erudite one too.

" It is quite certain that the *genii* and none other had mission to watch over every newly born man, and that they were called *genii*, as says Censorius, because they had in their charge our race, and not only they *presided* over every mortal being but over whole generations and tribes, being the *genii of the people*."

The idea of guardian angels of men, races, localities, cities, and nations, was taken by the Roman Catholics from the pre-Christian occultists and pagans. Symmachus (Epistol, I, X) writes : " As souls are given to those who are born, so *genii* are distributed to the nations. Every city had its protecting genius, to whom the people sacrificed." There is more than one inscription found that reads : *Genio civitates* - " to the genius of the city."

Only the ancient profane, never seemed sure any more than the modern whether an apparition was the *eidolon* of a relative or the genius of the locality. Enneus while celebrating the anniversary of the name of his father Anchises, seeing a serpent crawling on his tomb knew not whether that was the *genius* of his father or the genius of the place. (Virgil). " The *manes* [From manus - "good," an , as Festus explains. ] were numbered and divided between good and bad; those that were *sinister*, and that Virgil calls *numina larva*, were appeased by sacrifices that they should commit no mischief, such as sending bad dreams to those who despised them, etc.

Tibullus shows by his line :

*Ne tibi neglecti militant insomnia manes.* (Eleg., i, II.)

" Pagans thought that the *lower Souls* were transformed after death into *diabolical aerial spirits*." (Leloyer,

page 22.)

The term *Eteroprosopos* when divided into its several compound words will yield a whole sentence, " an other than I under the features of my person " .

It is to this terrestrial principle, the *eidolon*, the *larva*, the *bhoot* - call it by whatever name - that reincarnation was refused in *Isis* [ Page 12, Volume I, of *Isis Unveiled*, belief in reincarnation is asserted from the very beginning, as forming part and parcel of universal beliefs. " Metempsychosis " (or transmigration of souls) and reincarnation being after all the same thing. ]

The doctrines of Theosophy are simply the faithful echoes of Antiquity. Man is a *Unity* only at his origin and at his end. All the Spirits, all the Souls, gods, and demons emanate from and have for their root-principle the Soul of the Universe - says Porphyry (*De Sacrifice*). Not a Philosopher of any notoriety who did not believe (1) in reincarnation (metempsychosis), (2) in the plurality of principles in man, or that man had *two Souls* of separate and quite different nature ; one perishable, the *Astral Soul*, the other incorruptible and immortal; and (3) that the former was not the man whom it represented - "neither his spirit nor his body, but his *reflection*, at best ". This was taught by Brahmins, Buddhists, Hebrews, Greeks, Egyptians, and Chaldeans; by the post-diluvian heirs of the prediluvian Wisdom, by Pythagoras and Socrates, Clemens Alexandrinus, Synesius, and Origen, the oldest Greek poets as much as the Gnostics, whom Gibbon shows as the most refined, learned and enlightened men of all ages (see "*Decline and Fall*," etc.). But the rabble was the same in every age : superstitious, self-opinionated, materializing every most spiritual and noblest idealistic conception and dragging it down to its own low level, and - ever adverse to philosophy.

But all this does not interfere with the fact, that our " fifth Race " man, analyzed esoterically as a septenary creature, was ever *exoterically* recognized as mundane, sub-mundane, terrestrial and supra mundane, Ovid graphically describing him as -

Bis duo sunt hominis ; *manes, caro, spiritus, umbra*  
 Quatuor ista loca bis duo suscipiunt.  
 Terra tegit carnem, tumulum circumvolat umbra,  
 Orus habet manes, epiritus astra petit.

*Ostende, Oct., 1886.*

### **AN IMPORTANT CORRECTION [ From The Path, January, 1887. ]**

To ALL THE READERS OF *The Path*,

In the November number of *The Path*, in my article " Theories About Reincarnation and Spirits," the entire batch of elaborate arguments is upset and made to fall flat owing to the mistake of either copyist or printer. On page 235, the last paragraph is made to begin . with these words : " Therefore the *reincarnating* principles are left behind in *Kama-loka*, etc.," whereas it ought to read, "Therefore the *Non-reincarnating* principles (the false personality) are left behind in *Kama-loka*, etc. a statement fully corroborated by what follows, since it is stated that those principles fade out and *disappear*."

There seems to be some fatality attending this question. The spiritualists will not fail to see in it the guiding hand of their dear departed ones from " Summerland " ; and I am inclined to share that belief with them in so far that there must be some mischievous spook between me and the printing of my articles. Unless immediately corrected and attention drawn to it, this error is one which is sure to be quoted some day against me and called a *contradiction*.

Yours truly,

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

*November 20th 1886.*

Note. - The MS. for the article referred to was written out by someone for Mme. Blavatsky and forwarded to us as it was printed, and it is quite evident that the error was the copyist's, and not ours nor Madame's ; besides that, the remainder of the paragraph clearly shows a mistake. We did not feel justified in making such an important change on our own responsibility, but are now glad to have the author do it herself. Other minor errors probably also can be found in consequence of the peculiar writing of the amanuensis, but they are very trivial in their nature. - Editor. [*The Path*]