

Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury and Its Connection To The Theosophical Publication Society

Ernest E. Pelletier

In the December 1887 issue of *Lucifer*¹ magazine the Editors published “‘Lucifer’ To The Archbishop of Canterbury, Greeting!” This Open Letter was published as the lead editorial in the fourth issue of the first volume. *Lucifer* wanted to make “a brief statement of the position which Theosophy occupied in regards to Christianity” and to clarify “that Theosophy was not a religion but a philosophy at once religious and scientific.” The editorial stated that

[T]he chief work, so far, of the Theosophical Society has been to revive in each religion its own animating spirit, by encouraging and helping enquiry into the true significance of its doctrines and observances. Theosophists know that the deeper one penetrates into the meaning of the dogmas and ceremonies of all religions, the greater becomes their apparent underlying similarity, until finally a perception of their fundamental unity is reached. This common ground is no other than Theosophy — the Secret Doctrine of the ages; which, diluted and disguised to suit the capacity of the multitude, and the requirements of the time, has formed the living kernel of all religions.

It also stated:

Theosophists . . . are respecters of all religions, and for the religious ethics of Jesus they have profound admiration.²

The Letter goes on to describe how the Church of England with its inherent ecclesiastical organization from the Church of Rome, like its parent, is unable to fulfil the true spiritual function of a religion.

For several centuries the Church of England has performed the difficult feat of blowing hot and cold in two directions at once — saying to the Roman Catholics “Reason!” and to the Sceptics “Believe!” It was by adjusting the force of its two-faced blowing, that it has managed to keep itself so long from falling off the fence. But now the fence itself is giving way. Disendowment and disestablishment are in the air. And what does your Church urge in its own behalf? Its usefulness. It is *useful* to have a number of educated, moral, unworldly men, scattered all over the country, who prevent the world from utterly forgetting the name of religion, and who act as centres of benevolent work. But the question now is no longer one of repeating prayers, and giving alms to the poor, as it was five hundred years ago. The people have come of age, and have taken their thinking and the direction of their social, private and even spiritual affairs into their own hands, for they have

found out that their clergy know no more about “things of Heaven” than they do themselves.³

The tone and composition of these passages are very much in the style of H.P. Blavatsky — but did she actually write them?

Over the years there has been speculation regarding this Open Letter “To The Archbishop of Canterbury” — that it may not have been written by Blavatsky and/or she may have had a collaborator. Many believed and still believe that Richard Harte, a newspaper man from America who had gone to London to offer his services to Blavatsky, actually wrote part of this letter if not most of it. Boris de Zirkoff, a distant nephew of Blavatsky and compiler of her collected writings, strongly suspected that Harte had a hand in writing this letter. De Zirkoff stated:

There is some doubt as to the authorship of this famous pronouncement. Many of its passages, perhaps most of them, bear a close resemblance to H.P.B.’s style when engaged in a polemical exchange with an opponent.

He goes on:

On the other hand, there is a letter written by William Quan Judge to Richard Harte, dated February 3, 1888, wherein occur the following words:

“The ‘Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury’ is peculiarly able, well-conceived, and temperate, and two persons here expressed a wish that it should be printed and circulated as a pamphlet. . . .”⁴

De Zirkoff obviously surmised from Judge’s note that Richard Harte had collaborated with Blavatsky in the composing of this letter. But this may not be the case at all. To explain this we must first examine Judge’s involvement with this issue more closely. And in order to understand that, we must first examine how this Open Letter came about and how it came to be circulated.

By the time the controversy surrounding the Open Letter erupted, Blavatsky had attracted many open minded individuals to her who wanted to advance the *Cause* of Theosophy. Earlier that year (late January or early February 1887), a group from the London Lodge visited her in Ostend, Belgium. Gerald Brown

Finch, Bertram Keightley and later his step-nephew Dr. Archibald Keightley also went to Ostend to persuade Blavatsky to come to London. She was unable to leave at the time because of recurring inflammatory attacks on the kidneys. This developed into a serious kidney infection which nearly killed her. By the end of April she had recovered somewhat, and on May 1st she was carefully escorted by the Keightleys to England. She was brought to Maycot, Crownhill, Upper Norwood, London where she stayed at the home of Mabel Collins.

Within days of her arrival the small group of devoted Theosophists considered it advantageous to form a new Lodge. On May 19th the inaugural meeting of the Blavatsky Lodge of The Theosophical Society was held in Blavatsky's small room at Maycot. The first President was G.B. Finch.⁵ The Lodge was composed of fourteen persons. The members, "anxious to undertake active work",⁶ resolved to form a Publishing Company, which they called the Theosophical Publication Society (T.P.S.). With £1500 of advanced capital from devoted Theosophists, £200 was designated towards publishing a new magazine, *Lucifer*, and another £500 for *The Secret Doctrine*.

The controversy initially erupted with the magazine's first editorial, September 15th, 1887. The title was "What's in a Name? Why the Magazine is Called 'Lucifer'." In it Blavatsky stated:

So deeply rooted, indeed, is this preconception and aversion to the name of Lucifer — meaning no worse than "light-bringer" (from *lux*, *lucis*, "light" and *ferre* "to bring") — even among the educated classes, that by adopting it for the title of their magazine the editors have the prospect of a long strife with public prejudice before them.⁷

Blavatsky obviously sought to openly challenge readers into thinking for themselves.

The Open Letter "To The Archbishop of Canterbury" was also partly motivated from an earlier letter addressed to the Editors of *Lucifer* from L.F.Ff. (L. Florence Ffoulkes)⁸ on October 25th, 1887. This letter, and the response to it, were published in the November issue. Blavatsky noted that the writer covered an important point.

The writer seems to have felt that which many, among those who strive to help the suffering, have felt and expressed. The creeds of the church fail to supply the *intellectual* light, and the true wisdom which are needed to make the practical philanthropy carried out, by the true and earnest followers of Christ, a *reality*. The "practical" people either go on "doing good" unintelligently, and thus often do harm instead. . . .⁹

In the March 1888 issue of *Lucifer* the Editors (H.P. Blavatsky & Mabel Collins) were requested to call attention to its readers of an announcement regard-

ing a newly founded publishing company, legally registered,¹⁰ named The Theosophical Publication Society (T.P.S.).¹¹ International in character, "[t]his Society has been formed for the purpose of supplying those interested in Theosophy with literature of the subject in a readily accessible form".¹² Its first object was to endeavor "to further the cause of Universal Brotherhood by uniting all those who are interested in the growth of intellectual and psychic spirituality in an attempt to assist others less favoured by circumstances than themselves." Its second,

In pursuance of this [1st] object it proposes to place within the reach of the subscribers . . . (a) Reprints of valuable magazine articles . . . ; (b) Original papers which shall contain practical instruction for students of the Occult; (c) Selections from rare MSS. and works; and (d) Reprints in cheap form, and translations of books not otherwise obtainable.

The announcement also stated, in its third object, that "the Society proposes to circulate large numbers of elementary pamphlets explaining the principles of Theosophy and the nature and aims of the Theosophical Society."¹³ It becomes clear that the object of the T.P.S. was to disseminate the principles of Theosophy to a much wider audience.

Part of the "Prospectus" for the Theosophical Publication Society (as reproduced in *The Path*) explained why this new society was not to be confused with the Theosophical Society and why it was founded.

It has been found that many who wish to become members, owing to their position in their respective religious bodies, prefer not to have their names mentioned as belonging to a Society, one of whose objects is to forward the cause of free enquiry in philosophy, religion, and ethics. The "Theosophical Publication Society" has, in consequence, been made an almost entirely anonymous body.¹⁴

In a segment titled "To The Public" the announcement in *The Path* goes on to describe that "in view of certain libelous statements which have been made and circulated, it may be useful to state briefly here a few facts about the [Theosophical] Society. . . ." It reads in part:

The members of the Society are essentially a body of students, who join to the investigation of Nature an earnest desire to carry out in practice a purer system of ethics than that which prevails in society at large. Self-reliance, self-control, self-respect, willingness to draw knowledge from all sources, and a firm and heartfelt desire to be just and kind and forbearing towards others, are believed by Theosophists to be essentials to any progress in Theosophy.¹⁵

The above statement clearly defines the Theosophical position towards morals and ethics, and responsibili-

ties towards humanity. The Open Letter “To the Archbishop of Canterbury” editorial also questioned the outdated function of the Church.

The function of religion is to comfort and encourage humanity in its life-long struggle with sin and sorrow. This it can do only by presenting mankind with noble ideals of a happier existence after death, and of a worthier life on earth to be won in both cases by conscious effort. What the world now wants is a Church that will tell it of Deity or the immortal principle in man, which will tell it at least on a level with the ideas and knowledge of the times. Dogmatic Christianity is not suited for a world that reasons and thinks, and only those who can throw themselves into a mediaeval state of mind, can appreciate a Church whose religion (as distinguished from its social and political) function is to keep God in good humour while the laity are doing what they believe he does not approve; to pray for changes of weather; and occasionally, to thank the Almighty for helping to slaughter the enemy. It is not “medicine men”, but spiritual guides that the world looks for today — a “clergy” that will give it ideals as suited to the intellect of this century, as the Christian Heaven and Hell, God and the Devil, were to the ages of dark ignorance and superstition.

The editorial went on to point out the shortcomings of the clergy — that it was unworthy of inspiring ethical behavior. It stated:

Do, or can, the Christian clergy fulfil this requirement? The misery, the crime, the vice, the selfishness, the brutality, the lack of self-respect and self-control, that mark our modern civilization, unite their voices in one tremendous cry, and answer — NO!¹⁶

The editorial openly targeted all religious dogmas but specifically the Christian clergy for its lack of morals and ethics — damning people who questioned their authority while keeping the faithful ignorant. Their *modus operandi* was to divide and conquer while maintaining a voice of sovereignty over entire Nations.

The Open Letter to the Archbishop was to further the explanation about the nature of Theosophy and The Theosophical Society. An unsigned follow-up article, presumably by Blavatsky, elucidates: “Our object is not to destroy any religion but rather to help to filter each, thus ridding them of their respective impurities”¹⁷ and that, like every other publication, *Lucifer* “must fail to satisfy *all* its readers, and this is only in the nature of things and the destiny of every printed organ.” She added:

But what seems a little strange in a country of culture and freethought is that *Lucifer* should receive such a number of *anonymous*, spiteful, and often abusive letters.

In a footnote she stated:

It is not our intention to notice anonymous communications, even though they should emanate in a round about way from Lambeth Palace.¹⁸

Lambeth Palace is the official London Residence of the archbishops of Canterbury since 1197.¹⁹

These covert attacks only heightened the importance of this Open Letter to the Archbishop and the need to reach out to the masses as to the Objects of Theosophy. She pointed out that the churches had become crystalized in their ways and ideas, and that the clergy could not sufficiently inspire and lead its members into a more meaningful existence. In other words, she observed human nature becoming more and more materialistic and less and less spiritual.

It becomes clearer that Blavatsky was the author of the Open Letter “To the Archbishop of Canterbury”. The purpose, need and spirit of the newly founded Theosophical Publication Society are established in the words of this Letter. The Theosophical Society and the *raison d’être* of the Theosophical Publication Society were obviously very related in Blavatsky’s mind.

Blavatsky wrote about the T.P.S. to William Q. Judge on April 3rd, 1888, addressed to “My Dearest Brother and as Co-Founder of the Theosophical Society.” It read in part:

This Society is of great importance. It has undertaken the very necessary work of breaking down the barrier of prejudice and ignorance which has formed so great an impediment to the spread of Theosophy. It will act as a recruiting agency for the Society by the wide distribution of elementary literature on the subject, among those who are in any way prepared to give ear to it. The correspondence already received shows that it is creating an interest in the subject, and proves that in every large town in England there exist quite enough isolated Theosophists to form groups or Lodges under charter from the Society. But, at present, these students do not even know of each other’s existence, and many of them have never heard of the Theosophical Society until now. I am thoroughly satisfied of the great utility of this new Society, composed as it is to a large extent of members of the Theosophical Society, and being under the control of prominent Theosophists, such as you, my dear Brother W.Q. Judge, Mabel Collins, and the Countess Wachtmeister.²⁰

A most interesting statement from the “Prospectus” is the following:

The names of the members are known only to the officers of the Society, who are pledged to absolute silence; it being left entirely to the option of the members themselves to declare, or not, their connection with the Society, — The President himself, and one of the Vice-Presidents, being among those who have chosen to remain anonymous.²¹

The Vice-Presidents listed were William Q. Judge and Mabel Collins. The latter name is easily understandable owing to her affiliation with the Blavatsky Lodge and co-editor of *Lucifer* at the time. The Theosophical Publication Society was obviously patterned after the Aryan T.S. In an article published in *The North American Review*, August 1890, Blavatsky wrote:

In London there is a "Theosophical Publishing Society," which brings out *Lucifer* . . . and a series of pamphlets called the "T.P.S.," issued fortnightly, and many new theosophical works. Following the good example set to us by the Aryan Theosophical Society of New York — the headquarters of the theosophical movement in America. . . .²²

Circulation of English language theosophical publications in the U.S. came under the aegis of Judge and he would naturally have a lot to say in the publishing decisions. It is therefore only logical that Judge's experience would make him a valuable Vice-President of the T.P.S.

In addition, Blavatsky trusted Judge completely. While she was in Ostend, Blavatsky had asked and been informed by Master Morya about the details of Judge's initiation while he was in India from June to October of 1884.²³ Blavatsky, at the very least, would likely have thought it prudent to have his input in this project.

Another interesting name that shows up on the "Prospectus" is Richard Harte. He was an experienced newspaperman with the New York *Telegram*. At some point in 1887, presumably shortly after he had attended the Convention of the American Section of the T.S. on April 24th in New York, he left for London to meet Blavatsky and to offer his assistance. (Olcott eventually recruited his old friend for service at Adyar, which led to numerous difficulties.) It is not known if he ever joined the Blavatsky Lodge. Harte had been a long time active member of the Aryan T.S. and also served as its President. Now he was in London and holding the position of Secretary of the Theosophical Publication Society. Harte's experience as a professional newspaperman would have made him invaluable to the newly formed T.P.S. All enquirers and subscribers were directed to address the Secretary at 78, Clarendon Road, Notting Hill, London.

When Judge wrote to Harte on February 3rd, 1888, he was writing not to congratulate him on a well written letter but to plant the idea that the Open Letter "To The Archbishop of Canterbury" should be reprinted and circulated as a pamphlet through the newly founded T.P.S. When Boris de Zirkoff wrote "it is possible that Richard Harte and H.P.B. collaborated on this remarkable Editorial", he appears to

have mistaken Judge's letter for an implied congratulatory intent rather than as a suggestion. Judge was in the habit of sending short messages in letters expecting that there would be no ambiguity between him and the receiver. Judge was noted as disliking ambiguity. Because of the brevity and nature of his letter it would be easy for a third party, years later, to misinterpret the message. However, as de Zirkoff stated, "many of its passages, perhaps most of them, bear a close resemblance to H.P.B.'s style when engaged in a polemical exchange with an opponent." After reading and rereading this letter "To The Archbishop of Canterbury" it makes more sense that Blavatsky's collaborator (accepting that she had one) would have been one of the "Masters", likely Master Koot Humi, and not Richard Harte. Harte's involvement was more likely limited to proofreading and/or editing the document for her before releasing it. The Letter also fits Master K.H.'s writing style.

As mentioned earlier, Blavatsky thought that the T.P.S. was of "great importance" for the dissemination of theosophical ideas to the general public. This project was dear to her heart and she felt that much good could come of it if handled by the right personnel. It was Harte's responsibility as Secretary of the T.P.S. to deal with correspondence and Judge, aware of the importance of this Open Letter "To The Archbishop of Canterbury", wrote to Harte with the express wish to have it reprinted and circulated. Harte took immediate action to reprint it as a pamphlet. 15,000 copies were printed and circulated despite the fact that it had already been published in *Lucifer* magazine only a few months earlier. Considering the nature of this Letter and its importance, it must have been deemed wise to have a large printing done for mass distribution. The pamphlet is identical in appearance to the Editorial/Open Letter in *Lucifer*, December 1887. Only the page numbers differed. Perhaps the same plates were used to save on printing costs.

In 1889, "the second volume of the Theosophical Publication Society, took the name of the 'Theosophical Siftings'."²⁴ The letter "To The Archbishop of Canterbury" had been the first pamphlet issued and was collated as the lead article in the first volume of bound pamphlets. Harte's responsibilities as Secretary ended when he left for India on November 15th, 1888.²⁵

When Blavatsky arrived in England in May 1887 the enthusiastic individuals who had encouraged her to join them appeared to have the energy required to set the course of a renewed impetus for the Theosophical Movement. As a result, Blavatsky Lodge and the Theosophical Publication Society were promptly inaugurated. To set matters in motion the Open Letter . . . continued on page 67

The book is an interesting study in human character when all choose to work together towards a common, uplifting goal. It equally demonstrates how a mere handful of malcontents can insidiously gnaw holes in the fabric of unity. Disagreement with the establishing of various organizations on the grounds of Krotona led to discontentment for some. The E.S. members, in addition to their work for The Theosophical Society, "were 'ordered' by the Lord Maitreya as definite preparation for His coming" to work in one or more of three specific activities.

The three activities were: 1) the Theosophical Education Trust, to promote the ideal school system; 2) Co-Masonry, the ideal freemasonry; and 3) the Old Catholic Church, the ideal theosophical Christian church. (p.189)

Involved with the latter two was much ado concerning rituals. The idea of a theosophical church did not sit well either with some people.

Volume II is a detailed follow-up to the establishment of the Krotona site. Through the letters, documents and articles included, a very intriguing span of theosophical history is revealed. For those unfamiliar with this Movement it is a worthwhile endeavor to read through it. Parts of this history are truly fascinating to read when expressed in the words of the individuals involved first hand. The Appendix, "A Survey of Surviving Buildings of the Krotona Colony in Hollywood" by Alfred Willis, includes numerous photos and is an interesting addition to the text. Notes, Bibliography and Index complete the volume.

One difficulty encountered while reading is the abrupt change of subject one occasionally meets,

with no indication that the next paragraph is unrelated to the previous one and introduces a new idea altogether. The author should perhaps consider using a separator (for example, centered series of asterisks) between paragraphs/topics. While there is a brief summary regarding A.P. Warrington in the Preface, it would have been helpful to have biographical sketches of him as well as some of the other main characters involved, for example, Marie Poutz, Marie Russak Hotchener, L.W. Rogers, Alice Evans (Bailey), such as were included in Vol. I for Olcott, Blavatsky, Besant, Leadbeater and Jinarajadasa. A chronological table of the various organizations engaged at Krotona (for example, The Order of the Star, The Temple of the Rosy Cross, the Liberal Catholic Church, the Theosophical Fraternity in Education, Servants of the Star, etc., etc.) would also be very useful. However, this would probably need to be an entirely separate project. While these people and organizations are described in detail within the text it is difficult to retain the 'when, why and who' of each. As to the text itself, there are some typos but considering the extent of this material they can certainly be forgiven.

Krotona of Old Hollywood, Volume II, 1914-1920 by Joseph E. Ross is available through the author at PO Box 1442, Ojai, CA, 93024. It was helpful to have Vol. I on hand while reading Vol. II. Some copies of Vol. I are also available (\$22.95 U.S.). Vol. III, covering 1921-1926 (at which time Krotona moved to the Ojai valley), and Vol. IV are planned for future release.

Rogelle Pelletier

. . . **TPS** continued from page 61

to the Archbishop appeared in the new publication, *Lucifer*, which she claimed was established to "bring light to 'the hidden things of darkness'. . . to fight prejudice, hypocrisy and shams in every nation, in every class of Society, as in every department of life."²⁶ Readers familiar with Blavatsky's writings naturally conclude that it was she who wrote "'Lucifer' To The Archbishop of Canterbury, Greeting!" It is written very much in her style, a point which de Zirkoff acknowledges. It has been shown why de Zirkoff could have misinterpreted Judge's statement to Harte, and that de Zirkoff likely construed it to be a compliment to the addressee for a job well done, rather than a mere statement of fact regarding the text of the Open Letter. This Letter made some very bold statements and was obviously intended to attract the attention of those not in agreement with the Church. Blavatsky, whose pen had successfully founded several enterprises, would have wisely taken this task on herself. Its impact was then circulated far and wide through the T.P.S. which, for obvious

reasons at the time, allowed anonymity to its members and drew them to theosophical concepts. The Open Letter is still relevant today.

ADDENDUM

Research into the history of the Theosophical Publication Society yielded information which might appeal to those interested in knowing what happened after Harte's departure for India. A brief summary of the relationship involving the T.P.S., the H.P.B. Press, and Blavatsky Lodge follows.

Another interesting figure who appeared in the "Prospectus" of the T.P.S. was Countess Constance Wachtmeister. Although she was not in London at the time that the Blavatsky Lodge was inaugurated or when the T.P.S. was formed, she was quickly added to the Board as Treasurer. According to Wachtmeister, she arrived in London in early September 1887 just in time to help Blavatsky move to

a new location at 17, Lansdowne Road, Holland Park. Wachtmeister had first met Blavatsky in April 1884 while visiting London. She became one of Blavatsky's closest friends who stood by her during great physical and social distress. Wachtmeister, who had been staying with Blavatsky in Ostend, had taken time to attend to some urgent business matter in Sweden before rejoining her friend in London.

Wachtmeister became sub-editor of *Lucifer* and served as Secretary and Treasurer of the Blavatsky Lodge. Sometime after Richard Harte's departure for India she became Manager of the T.P.S. Slowly she built it up into a flourishing and sound business with a lending library for the use and benefit of subscribers to *Theosophical Siftings*. After Blavatsky's death in May 1891 she continued managing the business until she left for India with Annie Besant in the fall of 1893.²⁷ Before she left, Wachtmeister had written and published *Reminiscences of H.P. Blavatsky and the Secret Doctrine*. She also transferred the T.P.S. over to Annie Besant and Bertram Keightley who became the sole proprietors. Mr. J.M. Watkins who worked with Wachtmeister also left for India. Alfred J. Faulding was appointed business manager.

In 1889 James Morgan Pryse had set up the Aryan Press in New York to help Judge print H.P.B.'s *Esoteric Instructions*. That same year, H.P.B. cabled him to come to London to start The H.P.B. Press. In early fall 1890 The H.P.B. Press was started by the Blavat-

sky Lodge, with capital supplied by Dr. Archibald Keightley. After Blavatsky's death The H.P.B. Press also came under the control of Besant and B. Keightley. It was reported in *Lucifer* that it had been announced on July 12th, 1894 at the European Section convention that The H.P.B. Press would unite with the T.P.S. On January 1st, 1895 Besant and B. Keightley sent a telegram from India ordering that The H.P.B. Press be closed.²⁸ It was during this period that the Blavatsky Lodge became divided and on January 5th, 1895 adopted resolutions antagonistic towards Judge. The "Lodge passed some resolutions asking for Mr. Judge's resignation and also for explanations and replies to newspaper attacks."²⁹ The developments of this contentious period from 1894 to 1895 later became known as "The Judge Case". The attacks on Judge caused many to resign, including Archibald Keightley who had funded The H.P.B. Press. Twenty members quickly adopted new rules and regulations and by January 8th applied for a new charter to form "H.P.B. Lodge T.S." It was duly granted.³⁰ With The H.P.B. Press plant closed many of its worker reorganized themselves to become the Irish Theosophist Press.

On June 24th, 1896, the T.P.S. moved from its obscure location on Duke Street to a busy and more central thoroughfare at 26, Charing Cross, S.W. immediately below the *Manchester Guardian* where it continued producing literature for the Theosophical Society.

References

1. Mabel Collins was then co-editor of *Lucifer* along with H.P. Blavatsky. The mission statement was "A Theosophical Magazine DESIGNED TO 'BRING TO LIGHT THE HIDDEN THINGS OF DARKNESS.'" She also explained what *Lucifer* meant. On the front page of the magazine she placed the interpretation of *Lucifer* by Yonge: THE LIGHT-BEARER IS THE MORNING STAR OR LUCIFER, AND "LUCIFER IS NO PROFANE OR SATANIC TITLE. IT IS THE LATIN LUCIFERUS. THE LIGHT-BRINGER, THE MORNING STAR, EQUIVALENT TO THE GREEK ΦΩΣ ΦΩΡΟΣ THE NAME OF THE PURE PALE HERALD OF DAYLIGHT."
2. *Lucifer*, Vol. 1, December 1887, pp.241-242.
3. *Lucifer*, Vol. 1, December 1887, p.250. These words are as profound and as truthful as they were nearly one hundred twenty years ago. In fact, today, we have discovered that both churches are red-faced about the lack of morals the men of the church have demonstrated over the century. Universal minded individuals have come to realize that *any* return to *any* form of organized religion can only degenerate and distort the original impulse from which these ideas emanated. Theosophists, especially, should remember these wise words.
4. *Blavatsky: Collected Writings*, compiled by Boris de Zirkoff. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 1960, Vol. 8, p.268. *Practical Occultism*, edited by Arthur L. Conger. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1951, p.67.
5. Mr. Finch was President of the Blavatsky Lodge for a very short time. Thomas B. Harbottle, who had also gone with Dr. Keightley to Ostend to invite Blavatsky to London, became the second President of the Blavatsky Lodge of the T.S.
6. Letter from Thomas B. Harbottle, President of the Blavatsky Lodge To the President-Founder of the Theosophical Society. *The Theosophist*, Vol. 9, January 1888, p.xxxiv.
7. *Lucifer* Vol. 1, September 1887, p.2.
8. L. Florence Ffoulkes later joined the Theosophical Society September 17th, 1893, as a member of the Scottish Lodge. She also became a member of the Golden Dawn.
9. *Lucifer*, Vol. 1, November 1887, p.163.
10. *A Short History of the Theosophical Society* by Josephine Ransom. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 1938, p.239; *Old Diary Leaves*, by Henry Steel Olcott. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1910, Vol. 4, p.24.
11. In *Old Diary Leaves*, (1910), Vol. 4, p.24, H.S. Olcott refers to it as the "Theosophical Publishing Company".
12. *The Path*, Vol. 2, March 1888, p.387.

13. *Lucifer*, Vol. 2, March 1888, p.72.
14. *The Path*, Vol. 2, March 1888, p.387.
15. *The Path*, Vol. 2, March 1888, p.388.
16. *Lucifer*, Vol. 1, December 1887, pp.247-248.
17. *Lucifer*, Vol. 1, January 1888, p.341.
18. *Lucifer*, Vol. 1, January 1888, p.340.
19. *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary*, Unabridged, second edition, 1977.
20. "Letter from H.P. Blavatsky to the Second American Convention" held in Chicago Ill., April 22 and 23, 1888. *Blavatsky: Collected Writings*, compiled by Boris de Zirkoff. Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House, 1974, Vol. 9, pp.245-246.
21. *The Path*, Vol. 2, March 1888, pp.387-388.
22. "Recent Progress in Theosophy", *Blavatsky: Collected Writings*, compiled by Boris de Zirkoff. Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House, 1980, Vol. 12, pp.299-300.
23. See *The Judge Case: A Conspiracy Which Ruined the Theosophical Cause* by Ernest E. Pelletier. Edmonton, AB: Edmonton Theosophical Society, 2004, Chapter 17.
24. *Lucifer*, Vol. 6, June 1890, p.342.
25. Just before Harte left he wrote the introduction to a very rare pamphlet titled "The Hebrew Talisman" which was also included in the first volume. He wrote: "From internal evidence the Hebrew Talisman was written about 1836. No one ever discovered who the writer was. The edition was soon exhausted, and till now has never been reprinted." [*Theosophical Siftings*, Vol. 1, #13. Introduction to "The Hebrew Talisman" by Richard Harte. See www.TheosophyCanada.com for full text.] Some have since come to believe that it was written by an Adept.
26. *Lucifer*, Vol. 1, September 1887, p.1.
27. Besant and Wachtmeister arrived in India via Colombo on November 16, 1893.
28. *The Path*, Vol. 9, February 1895, p.408.
29. *The Path*, Vol. 9, February 1895, p.408.
30. *The Irish Theosophist*, Vol. 3, February 1895, p.88. The meeting took place at Dr. Archibald Keighley's consulting rooms at 62, Queen Anne Street, London, W. The following signed the charter: A. Keightley (President), Thomas Green (Vice President), H.T. Edge (Secretary), Basil Crump (Treasurer), Miss Nellie Cuer (Librarian), William Bruce and Mrs. Bruce, J.T. Campbell, Mrs. Cleather, Miss E. Amy Dickinson, Bertie Everett, F. Farmer, Miss A. File, Miss E. File, Ernest T. Hargrove and his sister Constance, Mrs. Hunt, Mrs. Monk, Mrs. Raphael and James M. Pryse.

. . . **Hounds** continued from page 64

cies inevitable in brevity. But what happens to the human soul once the physical body expires is an extremely important question, which has occupied the serious attention of genuine spiritual seekers over thousands of years.

It is also necessary to consider the suitability of the dog symbol itself. Anthropologists and zoologists come up with various guesses as to when dogs were first domesticated but the relationship between humans and canines has certainly been a long one and mutually advantageous. Over many millennia, there has developed a cooperative relationship between humanity and dogs. This involves their providing services to us based on skills which have been learned and/or developed, and which through selective breeding have become part of their genetic makeup. Even in this increasingly technological world, they are still widely used for herding, retrieving and guarding, in which capacities they are remarkably efficient. So it would have been natural for ancient mythographers to depict a dog to guard the threshold between life and death; or as a guide once the threshold has been crossed. It is hard to imagine a better symbol for these situations.

How about their other roles? At least in recent years, dogs' extraordinary senses have been put to work to aid in rescue attempts following earthquakes, avalanches, etc., to say nothing of sniffing for drugs and other illegal substances; even for detecting indications of arson after a fire. Conceivably, then, their senses could indicate to them whether or not a body was alive or dead, as in the Zoroastrian example which introduced this paper. This is by no means far fetched: dogs have been known to howl or act strangely at the moment of death of their human benefactors — this phenomenon has been recorded in many cultures over several millennia.²⁰

As for their roles as guides, in modern times thousands are used as companions to the blind and other severely disabled people. After training, all such work is done instinctively and willingly, and very efficiently, with food and human friendship being the only expected rewards.

Although H.P.B. seldom touched on the subject of dogs in this context, she did drop a few hints. For example when she describes ". . . the *dogs* (vigilance) which watch over celestial flock (occult wisdom)".²¹