

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on June 1, 2011 at 9:00pm

I am trying to figure out a way to post pp. 48-51 from the book, *Consciousness at the Crossroads*, and pp. 85-90 of *The Universe in a Single Atom*. In these two books the Dalai Lama gives the Kalachakra teaching on "space particles" or "empty particles," saying that this is the Buddhist view of the origin of the universe. In fact, this is specific to Kalachakra, and is not found in other Buddhist texts. But this is found in the Vaisheshika text quoted here earlier. Later I will try to quote directly from the Kalachakra texts that give this.

On motion, the Secret Doctrine teaches that this is eternal. See the quotes given on pp. 15 ff. of this compilation:

<http://www.easterntradition.org/first%20fundamental%20proposition%2...>

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on June 2, 2011 at 5:21am

Thanks to Capt. Anand, here are pp. 48-51 from the book, *Consciousness at the Crossroads*. Here the Dalai Lama tells the scientists that Buddhism teaches the existence of beginningless "space particles." These form the material basis of the universe. But a non-material cause causes them to form into the visible universe. This non-material cause is the karma produced by conscious beings from the previous universe. That is, material "space particles" form the visible universe under the impulse of karma, karma that can only have been produced by a consciousness, or more exactly, consciousnesses in plural. Patricia Churchland describes the standard current scientific view that sees only matter, the material cause, slowly evolving into organisms that begin to have consciousness. That is, consciousness arises from matter, and therefore comes later. The Buddhist view given by the Dalai Lama from Kalachakra is essentially the old Vaisheshika view.

Cosmology and the Origins of Consciousness

The discussion here returns to the origins of consciousness. His Holiness explains the causal logic behind the Buddhist understanding of the origins of consciousness and the role of karma in the formation of the universe. In relation to the Buddhist distinctions between sentient and non-sentient, material and non-material phenomena, Robert Livingston presents a scientific explanation of the biochemical distinctions between organic life and inorganic matter.

PATRICIA CHURCHLAND: One part of the picture that I didn't quite understand, or I guess that I disagree with, is the idea that there were originally two very different things that were created. There were material things and there were non-material things.

DALAI LAMA: My understanding is that by and large Western cosmologists still adhere to some form of the Big Bang theory. The question from the Buddhist view is: What preceded the Big Bang?

ROBERT LIVINGSTON: There are a lot of scientists who think that the time has passed for support of the theory of the Big Bang, and that there was not necessarily a Big Bang.

PATRICIA CHURCHLAND: Even if that's true, then all we can say is that we don't know what came before the Big Bang, and it could have been a yet bigger Bang. But I think Western cosmologists would say that we don't have any evidence whatever that there was any nonmaterial stuff. We can see the development of life on our planet starting with amino acids, RNA, and very simple single-celled organisms that didn't have anything like awareness, and the development of multi-celled organisms, and finally organisms with nervous systems. By then you find organisms that can see and move and interact. So the conclusion seems to be that the ability to perceive and have awareness and to think, arises out of nervous systems rather than out of some force that preceded the development of nervous systems.

DALAI LAMA: The Buddhist view is that in the external world there are some elements that are material, and some that are nonmaterial. And the fundamental substance, the stuff from which the material universe arises is known as space particles. A portion of space is quantized to use a modern term; it is particulate, not continuous. Before the formation of the physical universe as we know it, there was only space, but it was quantized. And it was from the quanta, or particles, in space that the other elements arose. This accounts for the physical universe.

But what brought about that process? How did it happen? It is believed that there existed other conditions, or other influences, which were nonmaterial, and these were of the nature of awareness. The actions of sentient beings in the preceding universe somehow modify, or influence, the formation of the natural universe.

PATRICIA CHURCHLAND: But then I want to know why you think that. What is the evidence for that?

DALAI LAMA: There are some similarities between Western science and Buddhist philosophy in that neither is dealing with absolutes or one hundred percent conviction. In this way we are both faced with options, out on a philosophical limb.

The tradition that evolved in India dealt with many fundamental philosophical issues. We have to account for the existence of matter in the universe. Do we want to say it arises from a cause or no cause?

The first fundamental philosophical question is: How do we determine whether something exists or not? That is the initial question. The factor that determines the existence or nonexistence of something is verifying cognition, or awareness:

the awareness that verifies. You have some experience; you saw something, so it exists. That's the final criteria.

Within the range of phenomena that fulfill the criteria of existence, there are two categories: things that undergo dynamic changes, and things that are permanent, or unchanging. The latter are not necessarily permanent in terms of being eternal, but permanent in terms of not changing. (In Buddhism, not everything that changes is physical.) For the phenomena that undergo change, there should be a reason or cause which makes the change possible. We can see that both the universe and human beings have this nature of changing. Therefore, they depend upon causes and conditions.

When we search for the causes, there are two types: substantial causes and cooperative causes. When you speak of one thing being the substantial cause of another, this means it actually transforms into that entity. For example, what exists inside a seed actually transforms into the sprout that arises from it. The seed would be the substantial cause of the sprout, whereas the fertilizer, moisture, and everything else would be cooperative causes. A farmer, for example, would be a cooperative cause for the arising of the wheat crop,

but he didn't enter into the wheat crop as did the seed.

PATRICIA CHURCHLAND: This is a little like Aristotle, who spoke of proximal cause and efficient cause.

DALAI LAMA: So we can look at these phenomena that are subject to change and we can go back to their beginning, and ask: Did this arise in dependence on a cause, or in dependence on no cause? If we accept phenomena which demonstrate the nature of arising from cause, and then posit an initial stage where there is no cause, that would be inconsistent and very difficult to accept. How can you say, suddenly, that everything happened without previous cause? There's a logical inconsistency in maintaining that something now shows the nature of being dependent upon cause, while at the same time claiming that initially it had no cause.

In the ancient philosophical treatises in India, there emerged two different philosophical systems, or schools of thought, on this question. One accepted that the original cause had to be something external, such as a God. From the Buddhist perspective, it is logically very uncomfortable to posit God as being the one cause of everything. The problem, then, becomes: What created God? It is the same question.

PATRICIA CHURCHLAND: Good. That was the question I was going to ask you concerning the first awareness.

DALAI LAMA: So when we ask, what is the substantial cause of the material universe way back in the early history of the universe, we trace it back to the space particles which transform into the elements of this manifest universe. And then we can ask whether those space particles have an ultimate beginning. The answer is no. They are beginningless. Where other philosophical systems

maintain that the original cause was God, Buddha suggested the alternative that there aren't any ultimate causes. The world is

beginningless. Then the question would be: Why is it beginningless? And the answer is, it is just nature. There is no reason. Matter is just matter.

Now we have a problem: What accounts for the evolution of the universe as we know it? What accounts for the loose particles in space forming into the universe that is apparent to us? Why did it go through orderly processes of change? Buddhists would say there is a condition which makes it possible, and we speak of that condition as the awareness of sentient beings.

For example, within the last five billion years, the age of our planet, microorganisms have come into existence roughly two billion years ago, and sentient beings, perhaps during the last billion years. (We call "sentient" all beings that experience the feelings of pain and pleasure.) Especially during the last one billion years then, we see an evolution into more complex organisms. Now we humans are experiencing this world. And there is a relationship between our environment and ourselves, in the sense that we experience pleasure and pain in relation to this environment.

From a Buddhist point of view, we ask: Why do we experience this universe in this relational way? The cause of our experiencing pain and pleasure in this present moment in this particular universe means that we must have contributed something, somewhere, sometime in the past to the evolution of this present situation. It is in this respect that the question of karma enters. In Buddhism, it is held that there were sentient beings in a previous universe who shared continua of consciousness with us in this universe and thereby provided a conscious connection from the previous universe to our own.

Comment by [Capt. Anand Kumar](#) on June 3, 2011 at 7:31am

it is held that there were sentient beings in a previous universe who shared continua of consciousness with us in this universe and thereby provided a conscious connection from the previous universe to our own.

Are those sentient beings the cause of our consciousness? What created or caused those beings? Are we back to square one?

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on June 4, 2011 at 6:39am

That is a great way to put the question, Capt. Anand. As I understand it, these teachings say that there is only a relative "square one" at the beginning of each period of manifestation of a cosmos. But there is no beginning to the endless series of cosmoses. Therefore the space particles themselves are without beginning, as is the karma that compels them into periods of activity and of rest. Since karma, according to Buddhism, is only produced by an act that is done

intentionally, it requires consciousness. While consciousness may manifest only during the periods of the manifestation of a cosmos, it, too, is without beginning. It must be there in potential even between cosmoses. So it is as beginningless as are the space particles.

Here is the quotation on the space particles from the Dalai Lama's book, *THE UNIVERSE IN A SINGLE ATOM*, from the chapter, "THE BIG BANG AND THE BUDDHIST BEGINNINGLESS UNIVERSE," pp. 85-90. This, along with the quotation from *CONSCIOUSNESS AT THE CROSSROADS* posted earlier, gives the Kalachakra teaching on space particles in simple language. We will next look at the passages from the Kalachakra texts themselves, and then compare these with the Vaisesika teachings. It would seem that the source of the Kalachakra teaching on ultimate atoms (or mathematical points) is the Vaisesika teaching. This teaching is also given in the Secret Doctrine.

[p. 85]

"According to Buddhist cosmology, the world is constructed of the five elements: the supportive element of space, and the four basic elements of earth, water, fire, and air. Space enables the existence and functioning of all the other elements. The Kalachakra system presents space not as a total nothingness, but as a medium of "empty particles" or "space particles," which are thought of as extremely subtle "material" particles. This space element is the basis for the evolution and dissolution of the four elements, which are generated from it and absorbed back into it. The process of dissolution occurs in this order: earth, water, fire, and air. The process of generation occurs in this order: air, fire, water, and earth.

Asanga asserts that these basic elements, which he describes as the "four great elements," should not be understood in terms of materiality in the strict sense. He draws a distinction between the "four great elements," which are more like potentialities, and the

[p. 86]

four elements that are the constituents of aggregated matter. Perhaps the four elements within a material object may be better understood as solidity (earth), liquidity (water), heat (fire), and kinetic energy (air). The four elements are generated from the subtle level to the gross, from the underlying cause of the empty particles, and they dissolve from the gross level to the subtle and back into the empty particles of space. Space, with its empty particles, is the basis for the whole process. The term particle is perhaps not appropriate when referring to these phenomena, since it implies already formed material realities. Unfortunately, there is little description in the texts to help define these space particles further.

Buddhist cosmology establishes the cycle of the universe in the following way: first there is a period of formation, next a period when the universe endures, then a period when it is destroyed, followed by a period of void before the formation of a new universe. During the fourth period, that of emptiness, the space particles subsist, and it is from these particles that all the matter within a new universe is formed. It is in these space particles that we find the fundamental cause of the entire physical world. If we wish to describe the formation of the universe and the physical bodies of beings, we need to analyze the way the different elements constituting that universe were able to take shape from these space particles.

It is on the basis of the specific potential of those particles that the structure of the universe and everything in it -- planets, stars, sentient beings, such as humans and animals -- have come about. If we go back to the ultimate cause of the material objects of the world, we arrive finally at the space particles. They precede the big bang (which is to say any new beginning) and are indeed the residue of the preceding universe that has disintegrated. I am told

[p. 87]

that some cosmologists favor the idea that our universe arose as a fluctuation from what is termed the quantum vacuum. To me, this idea echoes the Kalachakra theory of space particles.

From the point of view of modern cosmology, understanding the origin of the universe during the first few seconds poses an almost insurmountable challenge. Part of the problem lies in the fact that the four known forces of nature -- gravitation and electromagnetism, and the weak and strong nuclear forces -- are not functioning at this point. They come into play later, when the density and temperature of the initial stage have significantly decreased so that the elementary particles of matter, such as hydrogen and helium, begin to form. The exact beginning of the big bang is what is called a "singularity." Here, all mathematical equations and laws of physics break down. Quantities that are normally measurable, such as density and temperature, become undefined at such a moment.

Since scientific study of cosmological origin requires the application of mathematical equations and the assumption of the validity of the laws of physics, it would seem that, if these equations and laws break down, we must ask ourselves whether we can ever have a complete

understanding of the initial few seconds of the big bang.

My scientist friends have told me that some of the best minds are engaged in exploring the story of the first stages of the formation of our universe. I am told that some believe the solution to what currently appears as a set of insurmountable problems must lie in finding a grand unified theory, which will help integrate all the known laws of physics. Perhaps it can bring together the two paradigms of modern physics that seem to contradict each other -- relativity and quantum mechanics. I am told that the axiomatic assumptions of these two theories have so far proven impossible to reconcile. The theory of relativity suggests that the accurate calculation of the pre-

[p. 88]

condition of the cosmos at any given time is possible if one has sufficient information. Quantum mechanics, by contrast, asserts that the work of microscopic particles can be understood only in probabilistic terms, because at a fundamental level the world consists of chunks or quanta of matter (hence the name quantum physics), which are subject to the uncertainty principle. Theories with exotic names like superstring theory or the M theory are being proposed as candidates for the grand unified theory.

There is a further challenge to the very enterprise of obtaining full knowledge of the original unfolding of our universe. At the fundamental level quantum mechanics tells us that it is impossible to predict accurately how a particle might behave in a given situation. One can, therefore, make predictions about the behaviour of particles only on the basis of probability. If this is so, no matter how powerful one's mathematical formulas might be, since our knowledge of the initial conditions of a given phenomenon or an event will always be incomplete, we cannot fully understand how the rest of the story unfolds. At best, we can make approximate conjectures, but we can never arrive at a complete description even of a single atom, let alone the entire universe.

In the Buddhist world, there is an acknowledgment of the practical impossibility of gaining total knowledge of the origin of the universe. A Mahayana text entitled *The Flower Ornament Scripture* contains a lengthy discussion of infinite world systems and the limits of human knowledge. A section called "The Incalculable" provides a string of calculations of extremely high numbers, culminating in terms such as "the incalculable," "the measureless," "the boundless," and "the incomparable." The highest number is the "square untold," which is said to be the function of the "unspeakable" multiplied by itself! A friend told me that this number can be

[p. 89]

written as 10 to the 59th power. The Flower Ornament goes on to apply these mind-boggling numbers to the universe systems; it suggests that if "untold" worlds are reduced to atoms and each atom contains "untold" worlds, still the numbers of world systems will not be exhausted.

Similarly, in beautiful poetic verses, the text compares the intricate and profoundly interconnected reality of the world to an infinite net of gems called "Indra's jeweled net." which reaches out to infinite space. At each knot on the net is a crystal gem, which is connected to all the other gems and reflects in itself all the others. On such a net, no jewel is in the center or at the edge. Each and every jewel is at the center in that it reflects all the other jewels on the net. At the same time, it is at the edge in that it is itself reflected in all the other jewels. Given the profound interconnectedness of everything in the universe, it is not possible to have total knowledge of even a single atom unless one is omniscient. To know even one atom fully would imply knowledge of its relations to all other phenomena in the infinite universe.

The Kalachakra texts claim that, prior to its formation, any particular universe remains in the state of emptiness, where all its material elements exist in the form of potentiality as "space particles."

At a certain point, when the karmic propensities of the sentient beings who are likely to evolve in this particular universe ripen, the "air particles" begin to aggregate with each other, creating a cosmic wind. Next the "fire particles" aggregate in the same way, creating powerful "thermal" charges that travel through the air. Following this, the "water particles" aggregate to form torrential "rain" accompanied by lightning. Finally, the "earth particles" aggregate and, combined with the other elements, begin to assume the form of solidity. The fifth element, "space," is thought to pervade all other elements as an immanent force and therefore does not possess a

[p. 90]

distinct existence. Over a long temporal process, these five elements expand to form the physical universe as we come to know and experience it."

Comment by [Capt. Anand Kumar](#) on June 6, 2011 at 12:23am

Thank You David, for these two excellent posts. Space particles, multiverses, endless universe are all supported in the ancient Indian texts. For example, from Bhagvad-Gita:

Verse 2.12 Truly there was never a time when I was not, Nor you, nor these lords of men

Verse 2.17 Know that that by which all this universe is pervaded is indeed indestructible

Verse 2.24 This is eternal, all pervading, fixed; This is unmoving and primeval.

Verse 2.25 It is said that this is unmanifest, Unthinkable, and unchanging

Verse 4.6 Although I am birthless and My nature is imperishable, Although I am the Lord of all beings, Yet, by controlling My own material nature, I come into being by My own power.

Verse 11.20 This space between heaven and earth, is pervaded by You alone in all directions.

Above quotes are taken from the very precise translation by Winthrop Sargeant, published in 2009 by the State University of New York, ISBN 978-1-4384-2842-0.

Mr. Sargeant, in the chapter titled, "The Setting of Bhagvad Gita" explains:

Unlike the Hebrew and Christian conceptions of creation, the Indian allows for the infinity of time, and regards the universe as one of many that stretch, in cycles of creation and destruction, into the endless past, and that will stretch, in similar cycles, into the endless future. The mythology pertaining to this particular universe concerns a *primaeva* darkness, when all was water, until the eternal First Cause formed the *Hiranya-garbha*, the "golden foetus" or "golden egg," which floated on the cosmic waters, and, in later myth, became identified with the creator god Brahma. The egg divided itself into two parts, one becoming the heavens, the other the earth. Now, Brahma, the creator god, had a spiritual son (a product of Brahma's thumb, according to some sources) named Marici, and Marici's son in turn became the tremendously prolific sage-king Kasyapa, sometimes referred to as Prajapati, or "the Lord of Creatures." Kasyapa married the twelve daughters of Daksa (who is also sometimes referred to as Prajapati). Daksa was the son of Pracetas, ***an earlier being***. It is perhaps significant that these early names are personifications, though names as personifications are common throughout the epic. Brahma is thought to derive from the root *.jbrh* which means "grow" or "evolve." Daksa means "intelligence" or "mastery." (It is cognate with the English "dextrous" and its etymological ancestors.) And Pracetas means "clever" or "wise." In/ any case, Kasyapa impregnated the daughters of Daksa, and they gave birth to the gods, demons, animals and many other types of being. One of 9 these daughters, named Daksayani, or Savarnla, gave birth to the sun god, Vivasvat (which means "shining forth").

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on June 7, 2011 at 7:55am

This is really nice material that you have quoted for us from the Bhagavad-gita, Capt. Anand. It does seem that the Indian traditions are unanimous in teaching a beginningless universe, which periodically manifests. This is also what the Stanzas of Dzyan teach. So there is full agreement on this, indicating the Eastern origin of the Stanzas.

It is possible that the widespread acceptance of the Big Bang theory of the origination of the universe, even among the scientists who put it forth, is partly due to the influence of Western religious ideas. The Western world lives in a culture where the idea, "In the beginning . . ." is known to all. It is practically in our subconscious. So we are prone to think of an ultimate beginning.

The idea now being considered by some, that the Big Bang was just the origination of one particular cycle of manifestation, would fit in with the Eastern teaching. So there would be many Big Bangs. This is also more logical. Physics says that everything we see in the universe is subject to cause and effect. But an initial Big Bang is supposed to have occurred before anything, with nothing preceding it. We would then have something without a cause.

Comment by [Capt. Anand Kumar](#) on June 19, 2011 at 7:01am

I hope I will be permitted a little dsitraction from the main direction of the research here.

We have looked at the texts of mainly Hindu and Budhist traditions. However, I recently came across a very interesting account of Islamic cosmogony from a source other than the Holy Quran. In ab article written for the Indira Gandhi National Centre for Arts, Professor Arshad Hussain introduces a medieval period Islamic Scholar Ibn Sina and his treatise called "*Dar Haqiqat wa Kaifiyat-i-Silsilah-i Maujudat wa Tasalsul-i-Asbab wa Musabbat*", written in Persian language. The full article can be read online [here](#).

Some of the passages are relevant to be posted here. The emphasis where appear are added by me.

The author says that before the creation of the world there was nothing but **one point**, comprising four things, viz., the **elements**, the **reason**, the **nature** and the **psyche**. These were in their simple (uncompounded) form. All heavenly and earthly bodies were concentrated at one place and there was **no separate existence in any form** in the universe. The first thing to appear from this point (*Nuqta*) was reason (**'Aql**), which aroused nature (*Tabi'at*). At this juncture, the nature (*Tabi'at*) set in motion which created the units of space, i.e., length, width and depth, and surface and body also came into existence. Then the sensation (*His*) appeared in entity.

Though the elements get the above three units and motion from the nature and its movement, yet the main function is performed by psyche because the nature has no power of understanding. *Had the psyche not joined it, it would neither have divided into the three units nor have remained in a fixed quantity,* it would rather have been in the shape of a large lump with no end. In other words, the **work of the nature was to set motion in the point**. The nature also aroused the psyche and other things which were in a dormant and constant condition. Now began the work of psyche. It was the psyche which started division and separation.

Urdu language, which is very common in India and Pakistan borrowed heavily from Persian. Aql in Urdu means intellect or perhaps in this treatise will relate to sentience. According to this treatise it is the sentience which imparts motion to the nature for the manifestation to begin. A very brief anthropogony is also cited:

..... creation of plant begins with coral which was in water. It is the coral which leads to the beginning of the world of plants, as stated above. When the purity and brightness of coral increased, psyche joined it at this stage and spirit of developing psyche appeared in it. First of all there appeared wild vegetation, or the process of plant development continued and culminated in the formation of palm or date tree which is the only tree having animal characteristics. It became brighter and purer until the effect of psyche produced the spirit of feeling in it. The first creature which came into existence as the result of this development was shell and mother of pearl. It had some sort of feeling and mostly the feeling of touch. It would drift away from its place no sooner than it is touched. Thus began the animal kingdom from here. Its inner purity and brightness increased with the development of its creative stage. This development increased gradually and **attained the form of monkeys** which is the most perfect form of animals. The monkey shares numerous characters with Man. Reversion or development process continued until man comes into existence. This is the real description of the earthly creation.

It is really interesting to find that nearly 800 years before Darwin, someone thought that humans evolved from monkeys. Perhaps some Persian Scholar with reading of original text will be able to throw better light.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on June 26, 2011 at 9:08pm

Well, it is time to wrap up my contribution to this discussion on the Origin of the Stanzas of Dzyan for a while. I have pretty much said all that I have to say. I must now attend to some pressing tasks at hand that require all of my time for a couple months. After that I must devote my little available time to much needed research, before I may have anything more to say. It has been a pleasure

discussing these things here. Many thanks to everyone who has participated, and especially to Joe, who has made this possible.

Comment by [stefalive](#) on June 27, 2011 at 12:50am

thank's a lot for your participation David , it was very interesting reading you

Comment by [Capt. Anand Kumar](#) on September 20, 2011 at 5:45pm

Sometimes a break is good for rejuvenating the thought process. Our search for Fohat and other concepts mentioned in Stanzas has been lying dormant for a while and the mind has been occupied elsewhere. But a recent reading of Bhagwan Das' The Science of Peace revived the interest once again. The following passages will illustrate how differently Bhagwan Das thought about Fohat:

The Science of Peace, 3rd Edition, 1948, TUP:

Page 195, Note –

The Secret Doctrine says, "Fohat digs holes in Space"; which holes are atoms. The idea seems to be that if you regard Space as a Plenum, then atoms are to be understood or imagined as holes in it (like air-bubbles in a solid lump of glass), by contrast of ' finite individual ' against ' In-finite Universal ". *Per contra*, if you look upon Space as a Vacuum, then atoms have to be thought of as ' solid particles ', for the same contrast. A brief look into the 500-pages of minute-print Indices (Secret Doctrine, Vol. VI of the Adyar edition), at references to ' Atom ', ' Fohat ', ' Force ', 'Space ', * Plenum ', 4 Vacuum ', will convince the reader of the overwhelming character of the very numerous and very different statements regarding each.

Page 197 –

But just as the opposite poles of Subject and Object, Spirit and Matter, are but aspects of the One Unity in which they are synthesised, so, in the Manifested Universe, there is that which links Spirit to Matter, Subject to Object. This something is called by Occultists, (4) Fohat. It is the ' bridge ' by which the (4-a) Ideas existing in the (5) Divine Thought are impressed on Cosmic substance as the ' Laws of Nature '. Fohat is thus the (6) Dynamic Energy of Cosmic Ideation, or, regarded from the other side, it is the (7) intelligent medium, the guiding power of all manifestation, the ' Thought Divine '. . . . Fohat, in its various manifestations, is the mysterious link between Mind and Matter, the (8) animating principle " [p r a n. a in one aspect, j i v a in another] " electrifying

every atom into life." (The figures 1 to 8, in brackets, have been put in by the present writer, in the above excerpt.)

Page 198 –

In connection with this topic, of de-finite a-tom (indivisible, from Gr. a, not, and tonein, to cut, to divide) and In -finite space, the following quotation from The Mahatma Letters, 'pp. 77-78, may be helpful to bear in mind : " The whole individuality is centred in the middle, or 3rd, 4th, and 5th principles. During earthly life it is all in the 4th (Kamarupa, sometimes called Kama-Manas), the centre of energy, volition, will." Veda- Upanishats say, Kama- maya e` v a ayam purushah, '(in-divid-ualised) Man is Desire only ', i.e., Desire is the in-divid-ualising, focussing, finitising, defining, de-limiting, principle. Now, that which is Desire-Force in the mental, ideal, 'spiritual ', or 'subjective' aspect, that same manifests as Fohat-Force in the physical, real, 'material', or objective* aspect, and makes the in- divid-uai in-divis-ible a-tom. Fohat 'focusses ' the Universal, concentrates it, brings It to a point, makes it an in-divid-ual, (as a magnifying glass does the diffused sunshine). It does this by linking, binding (band ha), the whole and Universal I with a part-icle, a part-icular 'this ', an ' a-tom ', an up -ad hi, 'I-am-this'. The Secret Doctrine defines and describes Fohat and its doings in dozens of ways (vide Index) ; but this metaphysical idea will probably help to synthesise them all.

There are a couple of points to note here.

Comment by [Capt. Anand Kumar](#) on September 20, 2011 at 5:52pm

Sometimes the posts get cut off in the middle. Here is the rest:

There are a couple of points to note here. A casual reading of the stanzas usually results in thinking about modern physics due to its statements about "spiral Lines", "hardening the atoms" etc. Bhagwan Das makes it clear that it is not so. The atoms of the stanzas mean the individual. This is on the lines of Shiv- Shakti – Anu of Kashmir Shaivism. We have looked at Kashmir Shaivism earlier too, speculating about the spnada or sphuratta. Now it appears that something as deeply esoteric as the stanzas may have some parallels in Kashmir branch of Shaivism.

The second point that came across is that Bhagwan Das made it clear that Fohat is the name given to a group of separate but related processes rather than an event, phenomena or entity. All the processes that are required for dividing the infinite to produce an atom, i.e. the individual may be termed as Fohat. What these processes are is left to the imagination of the readers.

Another very curious thing that is apparent is that in the entire Pranava Vada, although Bhagwan Das explains Daiviprakriti in detail, he never makes the connection to say that Daiviprakriti is Fohat. Also in the Science of Peace he merely alludes to it by saying it is the force. Perhaps T Subba Row's reference to Daiviprakriti as Fohat was based on different set of texts and one wishes, he had revealed or at least named those.

The Science of Peace, Chapter X1, footnote on page 199:

Mula-prakrti or Matter and Daivi-prakrti or Force, together, make up the whole Sva-bhava of Purusha or Pratyag-atma... Force and Possessor of Force are not-different, not -separate though distinguishable.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on September 21, 2011 at 9:09am

Thanks much, Capt. Anand, for continuing the Stanzas discussion with this material on fohat. Here are a few more quotes on fohat. Perhaps other readers will also contribute to this discussion.

STANZA VI.

1. By the power of the Mother of Mercy and Knowledge — Kwan-Yin — the “triple” of Kwan-shai-Yin, residing in Kwan-yin-Tien, Fohat, the Breath of their Progeny, the Son of the Sons, having called forth, from the lower abyss, the illusive form of Sien-Tchang and the Seven Elements:

2. The Swift and Radiant One produces the Seven Laya Centres, against which none will prevail to the great day “Be-with-Us,” and seats the Universe on these Eternal Foundations surrounding Tsien-Tchan with the Elementary Germs.

3. Of the Seven — first one manifested, six concealed, two manifested, five concealed; three manifested, four concealed; four produced, three hidden; four and one tsan revealed, two and one half concealed; six to be manifested, one laid aside. Lastly, seven small wheels revolving; one giving birth to the other.

4. He builds them in the likeness of older wheels, placing them on the Imperishable Centres.

How does Fohat build them? he collects the fiery dust. He makes balls of fire, runs through them, and round them, infusing life thereinto, then sets them into motion; some one way, some the other way. They are cold, he makes them hot. They are dry, he makes them moist. They shine, he fans and cools them. Thus acts Fohat from one twilight to the other, during Seven Eternities.

.....

STANZA VII.

5. The spark hangs from the flame by the finest thread of Fohat.

Comment by [Joe Fulton](#) on September 21, 2011 at 10:01am

David, are there any updates on the origins of the word "fohat"? That seems to be the point around which this discussion ran into a real mystery.

Comment by [Capt. Anand Kumar](#) on September 22, 2011 at 7:19pm

Thank You David. These stanzas appear very relevant.

Kindly take a while to point out errors in the assumption below. If I am totally off the mark, please mention that too.

Based on the assumption that Bhagwan Das means Fohat to be the creative principle or process of creating humanity (in-divid-ualisation):

STANZA VI.

1. Mother of Mercy or Knowledge (Mulaprakriti or Daiviprakriti?). Lower Abyss - Mooldhara Chakra? Seven Elements - Seven Chakras?
2. The Swift and Radiant Ones - The vibrations or wave forms setting into Akasha? Thunderbolt of Katha Upanishad? Seven Laya Centres - Seven Chakras? Seven Stages of development?
3. Description of succession of root races?
4. Description of creation of elements? Fiery Dust - Earth? Ball of Fire - Fire? Runs Through, Around them - Space. Makes them Moist - Water? Fans & Cools them - Air?

STANZA VII

5. Description of Prana?

Thank You.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on September 22, 2011 at 8:46pm

No, Joe, I do not have any updates on the origins of the word "fohat." For each equivalent that has been suggested, some parts match and other parts don't match. It does remain a real mystery.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on September 23, 2011 at 8:52pm

Since fohat has not yet been positively identified, all we know about it is what the Theosophical texts tell us. So anyone's interpretation is as good as anyone else's. All I can say is that the Stanzas 6 and 7 that I quoted from are on cosmogenesis rather than anthropogenesis. Therefore they probably do not

pertain to the root races, but they would pertain to the globes, and even to the rounds. The laya centers could be chakras in the cosmos, or in worlds. The phrase, "The spark hangs from the flame by the finest thread of Fohat," does indeed sound like prana.

Comment by [Capt. Anand Kumar](#) on September 23, 2011 at 9:15pm

Thank You David.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on September 27, 2011 at 1:17pm

To be more exact, the verses 1-4 of Stanza 6 that I quoted on fohat pertain to cosmogenesis, and here is the dividing line says HPB in *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. 1, p. 151:

"With these verses — the 4th Sloka of Stanza VI. — ends that portion of the Stanzas which relates to the Universal Cosmogony after the last Mahapralaya or Universal destruction, which, when it comes, sweeps out of Space every differentiated thing, Gods as atoms, like so many dry leaves. From this verse onwards, the Stanzas are concerned only with our Solar System in general, with the planetary chains therein, inferentially, and with the history of our globe (the 4th and its chain) especially. All the Stanzas and verses which follow in this Book I. refer only to the evolution of, and on, our Earth."

Comment by [morry secrest](#) on September 29, 2011 at 11:07am

In his book, "Lost Continents: The Atlantis Theme in History, Science, and Literature", the author L. Sprague de Camp gives his opinion regarding the origin of the Stanzas of Dzyan: (pp. 57-58)

"*The Secret Doctrine*, I grieve to say, is neither so ancient, so erudite, nor so authentic as it pretends to be. For when it appeared, the learned but humorless old William Emmette Coleman, outraged by Madame Blavatsky's pretensions to Oriental learning, undertook a complete exegesis of her works. He showed that her main sources were H. H. Wilson's translation of the *Vishnu Purana*; Donnelly's *Atlantis*; and other contemporary scientific and occult works, ... She cribbed at least part of her *Stanzas of Dzyan* from the *Hymn of Creation* in the old Sanskrit *Rig-Veda*, as a comparison of the two compositions will readily show. Coleman promised a book that should expose all of HPB's sources, including that of the word *Dzyan*. Unfortunately, Coleman lost his library and notes in the San Francisco earthquake and died three years later, his book unwritten."

My question: Has anyone followed up on this paragraph and determined whether de Camp was accurate, and what Coleman was referencing?

I can't help but think how convenient it was for de Camp to have his source (Coleman) disappear under an earthquake, so to speak. Was de Camp the sort of person who would invent a source, just to support his unfriendly opinion of HPB?

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on September 30, 2011 at 10:23am

It is a great loss to students of Theosophy that William Emmette Coleman's unpublished writings were lost in the fire following the great San Francisco earthquake. From the little that he did publish, we can see that his critique would have been of great value in sorting out what actually came from HPB and what came from others in her writings. A good sample of what was lost can be seen in Coleman's appendix to Walter Leaf's 1895 book, *A Modern Priestess of Isis*, pp. 353-366, titled "The Sources of Madame Blavatsky's Writings." This may now be found on Daniel Caldwell's website:

<http://www.blavatskyarchives.com/colemansources1895.htm>.

This briefly outlines Coleman's researches that show the extensive presence of material throughout HPB's writings that was taken from then available published books. In general, this material was not acknowledged in HPB's books, and thus appears to be written by HPB herself. For example, Coleman on pp. 359-361 describes the sources for almost everything in HPB's book, *The Theosophical Glossary*. Several decades later Boris de Zirkoff in effect repeated Coleman's research on this book, and found the same things. De Zirkoff published his findings in the Winter 1967-68 issue of his magazine, *Theosophia*, under the title, "Who Played that Trick on H.P.B.? The Puzzle of the Theosophical Glossary." This article was reprinted in the 1983 book, *The Dream that Never Dies: Boris de Zirkoff Speaks Out on Theosophy*, pp. 81-85. It has also been reproduced online by Daniel Caldwell at: <http://www.theosophy.com/theos-talk/199901/tt00104.html>.

It seems that Boris de Zirkoff undertook his investigation through his own sympathetic researches in preparing the *H. P. Blavatsky Collected Writings*, without conscious knowledge of what Coleman had done earlier. Coleman, by contrast, undertook his investigation specifically to debunk HPB and Theosophy. But the results of both investigations are basically the same, that this book consists largely of material taken from then available sources. If this is true for *The Theosophical Glossary*, it follows that what Coleman reports on *Isis Unveiled*, *The Secret Doctrine*, *The Voice of the Silence*, etc., is essentially true, even though we may not follow him in his conclusions based on these verifiable facts. A large percentage of the material in HPB's writings is not actually by her, but comes from sources available in her time. Naturally, a large percentage of the material from these nineteenth century sources is erroneous. Thus, a large amount of the material in HPB's writings is erroneous. It is a great mistake for Theosophists to take all of what is in her writings as being fully accurate because of assuming that it came from her Mahatma teachers. This is where Coleman's research would have been of great help to students of Theosophy, in sorting out

which is which.

Like William Emmette Coleman and Boris de Zirkoff, I, too, have over the years found much in HPB's writings that comes from sources available in her time, erroneous sources. Since this material was not acknowledged as coming from these sources, I previously took it as coming from HPB and her teachers. This started for me around 1978 when I picked up in a library Emil Schlagintweit's 1863 book, *Buddhism in Tibet*. I had not then heard of William Emmette Coleman, and knew nothing of his critique. I must say that it was quite a shock to me to find material that I took as authentic in *The Secret Doctrine's* comments on the Stanzas of Dzyan in Schlagintweit's book. This was an absolutely pioneering book in its time, and as such it is necessarily filled with erroneous information. Much of this erroneous information is found repeated, with source unacknowledged, in *The Secret Doctrine*.

What would have been especially valuable in Coleman's lost expose is the sources he may have given for the Stanzas of Dzyan themselves. He believed th

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on September 30, 2011 at 10:30am

My last paragraph got cut off. It is:

What would have been especially valuable in Coleman's lost expose is the sources he may have given for the Stanzas of Dzyan themselves. He believed that everything in these Stanzas was also plagiarized. But here I think his bias against Theosophy carried his conclusions too far. I have been able to trace much of what is in HPB's commentaries on these Stanzas to sources available in the nineteenth century, like Coleman did. But I have not been able to trace what is in the Stanzas themselves to these sources. The statement made by L. Sprague de Camp that "She cribbed at least part of her Stanzas of Dzyan from the Hymn of Creation in the old Sanskrit Rig-Veda, as a comparison of the two compositions will readily show," is based on the presumption of plagiarism. A comparison of the two does not readily show this. As we have seen here in this discussion, where many different translations of the Hymn of Creation from the Rig-Veda were posted, this is a comparatively short hymn of only seven verses, while the Stanzas of Dzyan are much more extensive. If a person who had never heard of either of these beforehand was shown both, I think that person would be more likely to conclude that the Rig-Veda Hymn of Creation was based on the Stanzas of Dzyan, than that the Stanzas of Dzyan were cribbed from the Rig-Veda Hymn of Creation.

Comment by [Joe Fulton](#) on September 30, 2011 at 4:17pm

I called Ning Support and submitted a ticket. The rep looked at the two postings, the original and the re-copied cut-off. We will work with the Ning folk to get this addressed asap.

Comment by [stefalive](#) on October 1, 2011 at 4:02am

great elements you both are providing here...very enlightening for a seeker of truth, many thank's ..again.. :)

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 3, 2011 at 5:31pm

I want to be clear that Coleman's critique is something that I think is very helpful for students of Theosophy in identifying large amounts of material in HPB's writings that are not actually hers, but that I find his conclusion about this to be entirely untenable. Because there is much foreign material that is unattributed or unacknowledged in her writings, his conclusion is that her writings are entirely plagiarized. This, I believe, is quite impossible.

He says that the two major sources of The Secret Doctrine are Winchell's World Life and Wilson's translation of The Vishnu Purana. Leaving aside the nineteenth century science in Winchell's World Life, a careful study of the Vishnu Purana will show that it does not contain anything even close to the scheme of The Secret Doctrine. If we add in all the other books utilized by HPB, including Schlagintweit's Buddhism in Tibet, we still cannot account for anything but a small portion of the scheme of The Secret Doctrine. If we use all the Sanskrit texts published since The Secret Doctrine's publication in 1888, which in the case of Buddhism means over 95 per cent of them, we still cannot account for the scheme of The Secret Doctrine. It does not come from known sources.

Coleman's critique is valuable for sorting out the parts of The Secret Doctrine that HPB annotated on her own from the available nineteenth century sources, and that she did not acknowledge as coming from them, so that they appear to be part of the actual scheme of The Secret Doctrine. But they are not, and they should be distinguished. Then the scheme itself of The Secret Doctrine can be more clearly ascertained and accurately studied.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 8, 2011 at 9:08pm

[Delete Comment](#)

The issue of plagiarism is frequently brought up in critiques of the authenticity of the Stanzas of Dzyan. If HPB demonstrably used large amounts of material from then available sources without acknowledgement, then it is plausible that she took the Stanzas, too, from then published sources. However, the Stanzas have not been found in published sources. But despite this fact, the issue of plagiarism

still remains an important part of many critiques of the authenticity of the Stanzas of Dzyan. I have commented earlier that the whole idea of plagiarism, and especially its negative connotations, appears to be a modern Western phenomenon. It is not a part of the Eastern worldview, ancient or modern. On the contrary, innovation there has the same negative connotations as plagiarism has here. One is there expected to faithfully follow the great texts of one's predecessors without altering them or adding new innovations to them. It may be useful to provide an example of this.

If you buy the book titled, *Buddha Nature: The Mahayana Uttaratantra Shastra*, published in 2000 by Snow Lion Publications, Ithaca, New York, the title page tells you that you are also getting the commentary on it by Jamgon Kongtrul Lodro Thaye. Jamgon Kongtrul lived in Tibet at the end of the 1800s, where he was a major figure in the Ri-me or "non-sectarian" movement that took place there at the same time the Theosophical movement was taking place elsewhere in the world. The Introduction by Drupon Khenpo Acharya Lodro Namgyal tells you that "There are many commentaries on the Uttara Tantra Shastra written in India and Tibet," and that: "Especially outstanding is the commentary written by Jamgon Kongtrul Lodro Thaye." This is because "He was a saintly being prophesized by the Buddha in many sutras and tantras," and "His wisdom and achievement were such that he knew and assimilated every aspect of the philosophies and pith instructions of the eight practice lineages." The Foreword by Tenzin Dorjee tells you that "This book presents the commentary by Jamgon Kongtrul the Great, Lodro Thaye, on Arya Maitreya's Mahayana Uttara Tantra Shastra," and that "This commentary has been taught by Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso Rinpoche to many Buddhist students around the world."

If you had previously bought the book titled, *The Buddha Within*, published in 1991 by State University of New York Press, Albany, you might have read on p. 173 that "for the greatest portion of his RGV commentary, Kongtrul follows almost word for word a commentary reputedly by the Jonangpa Dolpopa." Dolpopa lived in the 1300s. On the following page you would see that the fact that Kongtrul's commentary follows Dolpopa's commentary almost word for word was fully known to Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso, who has been teaching it widely around the world. You would also learn that Dolpopa's commentary, in turn, "is little more than a synopsis of the RGVV," i.e., the Sanskrit commentary on the Ratna-gotra-vibhaga or Uttara-tantra written earlier in India. This is the norm, and no one in the East thinks anything of it. It is generally expected. The idea of plagiarism is quite foreign, even when a later respected writer, Jamgon Kongtrul, incorporates the earlier writer Dolpopa's commentary wholesale into his own. This commentary is still taught by teachers of the tradition as being by Jamgon Kongtrul.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 16, 2011 at 8:37pm

So can ascertaining the scheme of The Secret Doctrine help us in our search for the origins of the Stanzas of Dzyan? I think it can. A scheme of teachings must

be presented using particular terms, and these terms may be traced to particular systems, whether Vedantic, Buddhist, Platonic, Biblical, etc.

For ascertaining the scheme of The Secret Doctrine we must necessarily start with its three fundamental propositions, on which the whole system is said to be based. The first of these is an "omnipresent, eternal, boundless, and immutable principle" (SD vol. 1, p. 14). It is there described as "unthinkable and unspeakable," quoting the Mandukya Upanishad (as translated by Archibald Edward Gough in his 1882 book, *The Philosophy of the Upanishads and Ancient Indian Metaphysics*, p. 71). The Sanskrit words found in the Mandukya Upanishad are *acintya* and *avyapadesya*, there used to describe the "fourth," the all-encompassing or highest condition of the atman or brahman. The Mandukya Upanishad starts by saying that everything is the syllable om, that all this is brahman, and that this brahman is atman. Vedanta writers such as Shankaracharya sometimes added the adjective *para(m)*, "highest," to *brahma(n)*, the absolute, yielding the term "*parabrahma(n)*" for the absolute that is frequently used in Theosophical writings. Indeed, in describing the first fundamental proposition of The Secret Doctrine, HPB says (p. 16): "The Absolute; the Parabrahm of the Vedantins or the one Reality."

Because Vedantic terms such as this predominate in the explanations given in The Secret Doctrine, some writers have assumed that The Secret Doctrine is derived from Vedanta. To put this more directly, these writers hold that The Secret Doctrine cannot come from Tibetan sources using Buddhist terms and ideas, because Buddhism denies the atman and does not teach an absolute like the Vedantic brahman. Therefore, the Tibetan connection claimed by HPB is all "smoke and mirrors," deceptive devices used to deflect attention from the actual source of the teachings of The Secret Doctrine, namely, Vedanta; that is, known Vedanta. HPB, of course, says just the opposite; that Vedanta, like all known systems, is derived from the teachings of the Secret Doctrine or Wisdom Religion of antiquity. It is a fact that the major Sanskrit sourcebooks of Vedanta were available in published form in HPB's time. But did she use them as her source? Or did she use them only to explain the Stanzas of Dzyan, whose origin lies elsewhere?

By putting two and two together, we have earlier in this discussion seen that the term behind the first fundamental proposition of The Secret Doctrine, at least as it is stated in the esoteric *Senzar* or *Occult Catechism* that HPB drew upon and quoted, is *dhatu*, the one "element," which may also be translated from one of its two Tibetan translations, *dbyings*, as basic "space." To briefly recap, the first catechism quotation is (SD vol. 1, p. 9): "'What is that which was, is, and will be, whether there is a Universe or not; whether there be gods or none?' asks the esoteric *Senzar* Catechism. And the answer made is — space." HPB had said the same thing in an article published six years earlier (BCW vol. 3, p. 423): "Hence, the Arahat secret doctrine on cosmogony admits but of one absolute, indestructible, eternal, and uncreated UNCONSCIOUSNESS (so to translate), of an element (the word being used for want of a better term) absolutely independent

of everything else in the universe; a something ever present or ubiquitous, a Presence which ever was, is, and will be, whether there is a God, gods or none; whether there is a universe or no universe; existing during the eternal cycles of Maha Yugas, during the Pralayas as during the periods of Manvantara: and this is SPACE, . . ."

Then in a lengthy post of Dec. 6, 2010, we saw several of the many quotations from Buddhist texts th

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 16, 2011 at 8:39pm

Continuing where my post got cut off:

Then in a lengthy post of Dec. 6, 2010, we saw several of the many quotations from Buddhist texts that repeat a similar formulaic statement, like a refrain from a catechism, saying that whether the Buddhas arise or whether they do not arise, there remains the dhatu, the "element," or basic "space" (e.g., The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, translated by Edward Conze, pp. 148, 310, 352, 466, 499, 522, 544, 595, 609, 617, 620, 630, 636, 648). This leaves no doubt in my mind that the term from the esoteric Senzar Catechism quoted by HPB is dhatu in its Sanskrit version, and dbyings (or khams) in its Tibetan version. Moreover, this term is very old, since it is found in Gatha Sanskrit. On this, see the latest posting in the Online Sanskrit Texts Project, where Rajendralala Mitra discusses the Gatha language in his 63-page English introduction to his 1877 edition of the Lalita-vistara. If not Senzar, Gatha Sanskrit would be an early link to it. An entire text on the Perfection of Wisdom (Prajna-paramita) written in the ancient Gatha Sanskrit has survived, the Ratna-guna-samcaya-gatha. This text has been translated into English by Edward Conze, and is included in his translation of The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines and Its Verse Summary. The Ratna-guna-samcaya-gatha is the "Verse Summary" in this translation. The term dhatu is found in it at 10.9, 18.7, and 28.2. At 18.7, Conze translates: "the Dharma-element does not get exhausted nor does it increase."

It so happens that the adjective acintya, "unthinkable" or "inconceivable," as is found in the Mandukya Upanishad applied to brahman or atman, and quoted by HPB in reference to the first fundamental proposition of The Secret Doctrine, is in the Perfection of Wisdom texts applied to the dhatu. In Edward Conze's translation titled, The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, this phrase, the "unthinkable element," is found at least fourteen times (pp. 123, 179, 183, 185, 188, 193, 249, 253, 277, 305, 370, 374, 376, 377). Further, it so happens that the adjective nirabhilapya, "inexpressible," a much more common synonym of avyapadesya as is found in the Mandukya Upanishad and quoted by HPB from Gough's translation as "unspeakable," is also found in the Perfection of Wisdom texts applied to the dhatu. Here the Tibetan translation of dhatu is dbyings, basic "space" or "realm," so Conze translates this phrase as the "inexpressible realm." It is found in his translation of the Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, pp. 646-647.

On p. 646, Conze translates: "the inexpressible realm exists by way of ultimate reality." This is in the chapter known as the "Questions of Maitreya."

We had earlier referred to the well-known fact that Buddhism does not teach an absolute like the Vedantic brahman, and like the first fundamental proposition of The Secret Doctrine, to which the adjectives "unthinkable"/"inconceivable" and "unspeakable"/"inexpressible" might be applied. Yet there is in their texts the term dhatu, to which these adjectives are in fact applied. One school of Buddhism, the Jonang order of Tibet, focused on such passages in these texts, and postulated an ultimate that is empty of everything but itself (gzhan stong). The Jonangpa teacher who first taught this publicly, Dolpopa, regarded the chapter on the questions asked by Maitreya, of the Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, as the Buddha's own auto-commentary. By this Dolpopa meant that the other teachings of the Buddha should be understood as interpreted by means of this chapter. That is, this chapter gave the definitive meaning of what the Buddha taught in his other teachings. So for Dolpopa, the Buddha taught an element or basic space that is inconceivable and inexpressible, like the first fundamental proposition of The Secret Doctrine; and this teaching should form the basis of one's understanding of all the Buddha's teachi

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 16, 2011 at 8:42pm

Continuing once again from where my re-posted post got cut off:

So for Dolpopa, the Buddha taught an element or basic space that is inconceivable and inexpressible, like the first fundamental proposition of The Secret Doctrine; and this teaching should form the basis of one's understanding of all the Buddha's teachings, just like this teaching is said by HPB to form the basis of the whole system or entire scheme of The Secret Doctrine.

Thus, while the Vedantic inconceivable and inexpressible brahman would be considered in the Secret Doctrine to be a synonym of the dhatu, a search for the origins of the Stanzas of Dzyan is likely to be more fruitful in the particular systems that use the term dhatu for the ultimate.

Comment by [Joe Fulton](#) on October 16, 2011 at 9:56pm

A note to all involved. Ning is aware of the issue and we are looking to have Ning perform an upgrade to allow our network to support much larger postings in this and other blogs and forums. For now the limit is 2,000 characters (~400 words). When the limit is raised, this posting can be deleted.

Comment by [stefalive](#) on October 17, 2011 at 6:01am

I remarked that often the jonangpa tradition and its kalachakra comes as having similarities with some aspects of Dk teaching's, any more elements in that direction?

Comment by [stefalive](#) on October 17, 2011 at 6:05am

Thank's a lot david for this elements about the dathu within jonangpa tradition as a possible similarity with the Stanzas of Dzyan themselves apparently very close from some inner kalachakra teachings (with jonangpa tradition old a special place as a preserver)

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 17, 2011 at 8:52pm

Yes, indeed, Stefalive, Kalachakra has an extremely important element to add. In fact, it provides what is probably the single most decisive parallel with the system of the Secret Doctrine yet found. The second quotation from the Occult Catechism given in The Secret Doctrine, after speaking of "Space," the dhatu, brings in "The Great Breath":

"The Occult Catechism contains the following questions and answers:

"What is it that ever is?"

"Space, the eternal Anupadaka."

"What is it that ever was?"

"The Germ in the Root."

"What is it that is ever coming and going?"

"The Great Breath."

"Then, there are three Eternals?"

"No, the three are one. That which ever is is one, that which ever was is one, that which is ever being and becoming is also one: and this is Space.""

The "great breath" is a very distinctive term, much more specific than "space." Its Sanskrit would be maha-prana, and we would expect to find this somewhere in the vast Vedic literature. But we do not. As mentioned earlier, this term is not found in the comprehensive Vedic Word-Concordance prepared by Vishva Bandhu, et al. It is not in the Vedas. It is found in Kalachakra. In a Jonang text, the gZhan stong chen mo, written by a modern Jonangpa abbot, Ngag dbang blo

gros grags pa, it is spoken of. A section of this text was translated by Michael Sheehy as a PhD thesis in 2007, from which I quote this paragraph. The Tibetan for maha-prana is srog chen, which Michael here translates "magnificent vital force," the same as the "great breath."

"Because the basic disposition (gshis) of abiding reality's (gnas lugs) original actual nature is ultimately self-manifesting and spontaneous, it is the very identity of every aspect within the three realms. This is the essence of the lucid and magnificent vital force (srog chen) that is enduring (ther zug), everlasting (g.yung drung), all-pervasive (kun khyab), fearless ('jig med), and constant (rtag);²⁷⁰ what is forever without interruptions, free from partialities and devoid of proliferations—like space."

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on October 18, 2011 at 7:51am

Leon Feer, in his "Analyse of the Kanjour and the Tanjour - Annals of the Musée Guimet Volume 2" identified 2 textes referring to the Dharma-Dhatu, and the translation he made of the titles have some communality with what Alistair says below :

- Kanjour Volume VII (JA) - N° 6 : **Ratna-Kotni** (folio 460-474) - *Rin-po-chehi-mthat* , translated as "Talks on the primeval root (dharma-dhatu)"

- Kanjour Volume II (KA) - N°7 : **Dharma-dhātu-prakriti-asambheda-nirdeṣa** - *Chos-kyi-dbyings-kyi-rang-bjin-dbyer-med-par-bstan-pa*, translated as "Demonstration of the indivisibility of the root of the first being"

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 18, 2011 at 9:55am

I think you are right, Alistair. There has never been a sense of spatial significance with the Sanskrit word dhatu as such. The idea of a "sphere" apparently came when it was compounded with dharma to make dharma-dhatu, and then as part of this compound was translated into Tibetan as dbyings. We often see this compound translated as the "sphere of phenomena." The idea of a sphere of something seems to come mostly from the Tibetan word dbyings. In recognition of this, we see that Jeffrey Hopkins in his translation of Dolpopa's Mountain Doctrine has instead used for dharma-dhatu the "element of attributes." This follows the Sanskrit more literally. It also agrees with your conclusion.

The next paragraph of the Jonangpa abbot's treatise that I quoted on the "great breath" speaks of the dhatu. You will see that Michael Sheehy has here translated dhatu as "expanse."

"From within this expanse (*dhātu, dbyings*), the tangible and intangible are self-expressions of the actuality of phenomena (*dharmatā, chos nyid*), the excellent and sublime abiding reality that remains always unimpeded. This is the natural

identity of the pure identity that is itself things just as they exist, the common ground (*gzhi gcig*) for the wisdom that goes beyond both saṃsāra and nirvāṇa."

For those who are trying to study this material, I should also note that Michael Sheehy's translation, "abiding reality" (*gnas lugs*), is "mode of subsistence" in Jeffrey Hopkins' translation of Dolpopa's Mountain Doctrine.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 18, 2011 at 10:41am

The second sutra that you refer to, Jacques, the **Dharma-dhātu-prakṛiti-asambheda-nirdeṣa** - *Chos-kyi-dbyings-kyi-rang-bjin-dbyer-med-par-bstan-pa*, sounds intriguing. This title is translated by Jeffrey Hopkins in the bibliography of Dolpopa's Mountain Doctrine as: "Sutra Indicating the Indivisible Nature of the Element of Attributes." But it is not in his index, so I do not know if Dolpopa quotes it or not.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on October 18, 2011 at 1:51pm

The **Dharma-dhātu-prakṛiti-asambheda-nirdeṣa** is quoted by Jeffrey Hopkins - Dolpopa's Mountain Doctrine on page 392 (note 369) in regard with sameness between *self-emptiness* and *element of attributes*.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 19, 2011 at 9:21am

Thanks, Jacques, for finding the reference to this sutra in Dolpopa's Mountain Doctrine. Glad to have this information. In the following paragraph, Dolpopa speaks of "thusness." This Tibetan word, *de bzhin nyid*, Sanskrit *tathatā*, has more often been translated as "suchness." In this book, however, Jeffrey Hopkins uses "suchness" to translate the Tibetan *de kho na nyid*, Sanskrit *tattva*. I do not know of anyone else who does this. The usual translation of *tattva* in Buddhist texts is "reality." Just wanted to call attention to this, to help avoid confusion when studying this book.

I also wanted to clarify my statement made yesterday about the word *dhātu*, that there has never been a sense of spatial significance with the word *dhātu* as such. This refers to it as used in non-Buddhist texts, and thus as this word is defined in the Sanskrit-English dictionaries of Monier-Williams and V. S. Apte. In Buddhist texts, however, it is additionally used in terms like *tri-dhātu*, *loka-dhātu*, etc., where it does have the sense of a realm. This sense is recorded in Franklin Edgerton's Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on October 22, 2011 at 12:32pm

Additionally, Judith Tyberg in her "Sanskrit Keys", p. 93, translates tattva as "thatness". My humble understanding of tattva as "reality" is that it is limited to an object, while the absolute "reality" considered by itself in the sense of Hegel would be in Sanskrit "sat". Interestingly, in Old High German "sat" is "full" or "fullness".

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 23, 2011 at 3:54pm

Thanks for this helpful reference on tattva, Frank, to Judith Tyberg's book. I have now looked up this reference. After giving "reality," Judith gives "that-ness," which is the literal translation of "tat-tva." The word "tat" is a demonstrative pronoun, "that." The suffix "tva" means "-ness" or "-hood," as in buddhatva, "buddhahood." She then brings in the doctrine of the seven tattvas. Here, and also in the teaching of the twenty-five tattvas of Samkhya, tattva is often translated as "principle," and would indeed usually refer to a reality that is limited to an object. For the absolute reality, my impression, too, is that "sat" would be the preferred term in Hinduism, or even just tat, "that."

In Buddhism, however, "sat" is not used, probably because the Buddhists wanted to avoid reference to "being," which "sat" literally means. The Buddhists see this as "being" in a contrasting pair with "non-being," and therefore as being limited to duality. The great Hindu writers, of course, make it clear that "sat" as they mean it is beyond duality. In any case, since sat is not used in Buddhism, Buddhist writers were free to apply the term tattva to their ultimate truth, and they did so. Jeffrey Hopkins explains that he used "suchness" for Tibetan de kho na nyid (Sanskrit tattva), and "thusness" for Tibetan de bzhin nyid (Sanskrit tathatā) because a Tibetan commentator took them as being equivalent (Emptiness in the Mind-Only School of Buddhism, p. 69, fn.b). However, doing this considerably confuses things for the English-language reader when most previous translators use "suchness" for tathatā and "reality" for tattva.

It may be added that tattva has also sometimes been translated as "truth." I prefer not to use this translation for tattva, in order to reserve it for the term satya, which directly means "truth." The phrase tattvatah, with the suffix tah, meaning "according to," is commonly used to mean "according to reality" or "according to truth." It may be applied to anything, just like saying in English, "in truth," the earth is round, or "in reality," the earth is round. But of course, this is not using tattva as a technical term. It is just to illustrate its meaning. As a technical term, tattva may be used for the ultimate truth or reality in Hinduism, too. We see the term eka-tattva, the "one reality," familiar to students of Theosophy, used in the Yoga-Vasistha, and also in the Vedanta-dindima. Its opening verse says:

"May the one reality (tattvam ekam) that the proclamations (lit. "drumbeats") of Vedanta sound forth, the radiance designated as daksinamurti, be present before us."

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on October 24, 2011 at 10:23am

In an interesting [conference](#) given in August 2011 under the ITC umbrella, one of the presenter, talking about "Emanation and Fohat as the basis for Electrical Universe", track down the fohat word to the Tibetan-Mongolian verbal root **foh**, which could be translated as "Cosmic life or Cosmic vitality" - "Buddha-life or Buddha-vitality".

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 24, 2011 at 8:54pm

Unfortunately, neither Tibetan nor Mongolian has a verbal root foh, nor do either of those languages have the letter or sound "f". For that matter, Tibetan does not use verbal roots, like Sanskrit does. I do not know where those meanings would have come from.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on October 25, 2011 at 2:41am

Christmas Humphreys in his Dictionary of Buddhism gives Fohat as of Chinese origin...

@David: Thanks. I'll answer soon. Cheers.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 25, 2011 at 8:49pm

Since the Chinese word "fo" means "buddha," this would seem to be a better guess than Tibetan and Mongolian. However, no one seems to know of a Chinese word "hat" for the second syllable. So, unless such a word is found, we can no more say that fohat is of Chinese origin than we can say that it is of Tibetan or Mongolian origin.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 27, 2011 at 12:40pm

We are fortunate to now have participating here a native German-speaking Theosophical researcher, Frank Reitemeyer. We earlier had some questions regarding the German translations of Rig-veda 10.129 that we could not answer. Perhaps we can now investigate a long-standing question regarding the source of a quotation in The Secret Doctrine. In vol. 1, on p. 6, we read:

"'Fire and Flame destroy the body of an Arhat, their essence makes him immortal.' (Bodhi-mur, Book II)."

No one has ever traced this quotation. In Alex Wayman's Introduction to the 1978 book, Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real, we learn that the Bodhi-

mur or Bodhi mor is the abbreviated title of the Mongolian translation of Tsong kha pa's Lam rim chen mo (p. 4): "The Mongolian translation of the Lam rim chen mo, with the abbreviated reference Bodhi Mor, is printed in two parts on this basis." So where did HPB get access to this quotation?

The Bodhi-mur or Bodhimor is mentioned several times in Emil Schlagintweit's 1863 book, Buddhism in Tibet (pp. 62, 63 fn., 68 fn., 75 fn., 77, 101 fn.), a book that HPB draws on for many of her comments regarding Tibetan Buddhism. This book is now available online, minus its glossary and its pictures. I do not have the URL for this, as I usually use the printed book. The quotation that we are looking for is not found in Schlagintweit's book. He refers to Isaac Jacob Schmidt's 1829 German translation of Ssanang Ssetsen's Mongolian book, Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen, published in St. Petersburg, adding (p. 63 fn.): "The annotations to Ssanang Ssetsen contain translations from the Bodhimor, and other Mongolian books."

This book of Schmidt's is apparently the source of all quotations from the Bodhimor quoted by later writers. Probably the quotation we are looking for is to be found in this book. We do not know if HPB got it directly from Schmidt's book, or whether it was quoted in an intermediary book, such as Wassiljew's Der Buddhismus (referred to at SD 1.43 fn.). Schmidt's 1828 book is now available online at Google Books: <http://books.google.com/books?id=C2oiAQAAAJ&printsec=frontcov...>

I have looked in this book a little, but it will take a German-speaker to find this quotation.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on October 28, 2011 at 10:45am

Hi David and all fellow-Dzayan researchers, thank you for the welcome. I'll try to find out the said quote. Thank you that you pointed out already to the scan of Schmidt's book. I sent a pdf file of it around some days ago. If anyone needs this, I'll be happy to forward it.

On this website there are also other books of Schmidt. It is very time consuming to save all single pages as picture to make a pdf of it. To download it as pdf you have to register as a scholar. Perhaps someone here can do this and download all the books and upload them on an upload server for all here.

Schlagintweit's 1863 book, Buddhism in Tibet is online at:

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/bud/bit/index.htm>

I did a first quick search with the search function, but did not find the quote.

Wassiljew's "Der Buddhismus" is online here:

<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/neu/Allgemein/Wassiljew%20-%20Der...>

The pdfs are not searchable and I need to read them analog...:-) (with my physical eyes) and come back to it in a few days.

I have a hunch that the German language might be of help for Blavatsky students. Did you know, that Katherine Tingley in 1898 in one of her magazines is saying that the Theos. Movement barely need German scholarship? Well, today half-dead Germany also barely needs German scholarship...:-). For that reason Tingley was in Germany in 1896, and together with Purucker in 1923 and 1926 - but without success.

In 1919 KT in the newly launched Theosophical University Kenneth Morris started philological lectures, pointing out the importance of the German language.

If we understand it not from the worldly point of view, but from within, it is quite logical that the theosophical symphony consists of several different instruments. From that insight we lonely wolves scattered around the world have here now the opportunity to come together here. We have here the potentiality to do the intellectual part of the preparatory work for 2075.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on October 28, 2011 at 11:22am

Don't miss this sid website with its goldmine of Buddhist texts in several sub- and sub-sub-dictionaries:

<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/Buddhism%20&%20Meditation%20I/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/Buddhism%20&%20Meditation%20II/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/Buddhism%20--%20General/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/Poetry/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/deutschsprachig/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/deutschsprachig/dharmacolleg/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/neu/Allgemein/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/neu/Allgemein/Potter%20-%20Encycl...>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/neu/History%20and%20Art/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/neu/Texte/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/neu/Tibet/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/neu/Tibet/Three%20Tantric%20Life%...>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/neu/Western/>
<http://www.steppenspiel.at/ebooks/neu/Zen/>

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on October 28, 2011 at 12:14pm

@FOHAT

In the Occult Encyclopedic Fohat is described as of Tibetan-Mongolian origin:

<http://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/etgloss/fa-fz.htm>

In the Roerich lineage there is also Para-Fohat and Pan-Fohat:

http://logos_endless_summer.tripod.com/id166.html

Comment by [Joe Fulton](#) on October 28, 2011 at 4:51pm

Fohat is a word that, as far as we currently know of does not exist before Letter #13 of the Mahatma Letters to AP Sinnett. See the very learned discussion on Fohat in the Stanzas of Dzyan Research Project. Fohat is somewhere out there we just haven't found it anywhere outside of "theosophical" sources yet. We'll keep digging.

Fohat is probably the biggest sticking point in linking the theosophical traditions together with Buddhism and other schools of thought. The greatest service that can happen by a researcher in this field is to correctly establish the etymology of the word. That's a tough one.

Thanks Frank, for the links!

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 31, 2011 at 12:47pm

In the PDF of *Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen* that I downloaded from Google Books, searches do not work. But as it is found on their site, searches work. A search there for the word Feuer (fire) turns up 16 pages. One of these also has the word Flamme (flame), p. 181. I would like to find the source of the SD quote, because there appears to be something wrong with it. We now have a full published English translation of the *Lam rim chen mo* in three volumes, titled *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment*, and also an earlier English translation by Alex Wayman of just its latter part, titled *Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real*, in which this quotation is supposed to be found. But no such quotation is found in the published English translations. This, of course, allows HPB's detractors to conclude that she just made this up from her imagination.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on October 31, 2011 at 1:33pm

There is also a complete french translation - *Le Grand Livre de la Progression vers l'Eveil* - 2 volumes, published in 1990...but not in digital version. In the introduction, one can read that Tsongkhapa wrote, together with the *Lam rim chen mo*, a shorter version called *Lam rim chung pa*, and also a very short version called *Lam rim bsdus don*.

HPB quoted a "Book of the Aphorisms of Tson-ka-pa" in the SD Vol I, page 635, when, talking about **Fohat**, she says : "For the blessed workers have received the *Thyan-kam*, in the eternity... *Thyan kam* is the power or knowledge of guiding the impulses of cosmic energy in the right direction".

So she may also be referring to a shorter version of the Lam rim chen mo when she quoted it.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on October 31, 2011 at 2:23pm

Most probable candidate for tracing fohat would imho be the Chinese syllable **po** (pinyin transliteration) or **p'o** (Wade-Giles), of which HPB writes that it is "the root of the Tibetan word fohat". In CW X,354 she calls pho the "animal soul". In CW IV, 242-243 it is also identified with the animal soul, or kAma manas. She also mentions that it would be a "Turanian compound", which means that it would be Old Chinese, and consisting of (two) parts. See also Richard P. Taylor, Blavatsky and Buddhism, ..., 1999.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 31, 2011 at 2:37pm

Jacques, Wassiljew's 1860 German book that apparently quotes Schmidt's 1829 German book was published in French translation in 1863 as: *Le Bouddhisme: ses dogmes, son histoire et sa littérature*, by Vasilij Pavlovič Vasil'ev. It may be more likely that HPB would quote from a French book than from a German book, because she knew the language better. Perhaps you have already checked this book for these quotes, including the one you mentioned from "Book of the Aphorisms of Tson-ka-pa," and also for the elusive fohat.

A note for all our English speakers regarding the shorter Lam rim works by Tsong kha pa: English translations of most of these are listed in <http://www.easterntradition.org/etri%20bib-tsongkhapa.pdf>, pp. 7-11.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on October 31, 2011 at 2:44pm

The article of Richard P. Taylor can be found [here](#). His conclusion on fohat being derived from the Tibetan spros pa is, I think, speculative.

He notes that HPB first mentions fohat in 1885 here: "Blavatsky's footnote to an article entitled "Zoroastrianism on the Septenary Constitution of Man," reprinted in *Five Years of Theosophy*, p. 152"

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 31, 2011 at 4:02pm

Thanks, Ingmar, for your contributions. What does the Chinese syllable po or p'o mean? There is in Samuel Beal's 1871 *Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese* mention on p. 389 of the "pho-mun" or "manifestation section" of the

Lotus Sutra. I do not know about the Chinese syllable that he wrote as "pho," but in Tibetan, like in Sanskrit, the "ph" is an aspirated "p"; it is not an "f" sound.

Yes, I agree that Richard Taylor's spros pa is speculative, and I think he also agrees. I do not think that he holds this any longer. We discussed this at some length years ago, after he wrote this. The first occurrence of fohat that has been found in the Theosophical writings is in the Cosmological Notes, written in the fall of 1881. Its first mention is:

(1) What are the different kinds of knowledge?

The real (Dgyu) and the unreal (Dgyu-mi). Dgyu becomes Fohat when in its activity — active agent of will-electricity — no other name.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on October 31, 2011 at 5:09pm

The po we are talking about here is **pò** or po4 (4th tone). The character is found for example [here](#) and in other in common modern Chinese dictionaries. De meaning in my "A Chinese-English Dictionary (Rev. Ed.)" is 1. soul and 2. vigour; spirit. In my older pocket dictionary of Goodrich I find "animal soul", which is literally what HPB attributes to her **pho**.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on October 31, 2011 at 5:27pm

It would be like an aspirated "p", as in Tibetan, not an "f". It would be unclear why HPB writes an f in fohat.

I have not studied the work of Samuel Beal (yet), but some time ago I came across the term p'o in "The Secret of the Golden Flower" which is partly found [here](#) on Google Books. It is also called "animal soul" in the commentary of Carl Jung, page 116.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on October 31, 2011 at 5:59pm

魄

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on October 31, 2011 at 6:49pm

I see it is also to be found in Soothill and Hodous' "A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms", on p. 430 under **húnpò**, which also generally means soul: "Animus and anima; the spiritual nature or mind, and the animal soul; the two are defined as mind and body or mental and physical, the invisible soul inhabiting the visible body, the former being celestial, the latter terrestrial."

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on October 31, 2011 at 7:28pm

Thanks, Ingmar, for all the helpful information. We of course have many other aspects of fohat to integrate into the meaning of any equivalent we might find, such as the "fiery whirlwind," etc. But on the hypothesis that we can do this with the Chinese po, what would be the second syllable, hat?

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on October 31, 2011 at 11:29pm

The many different aspects of fohat may all be related to HPB's description of fohat as "cosmic kAma". My notes of a few years ago do not tell me where she wrote that, but it should be easy to find. In SD I,108 and onwards she writes that fohat is comparable to eros, the will of the creative logos, the power of affinity and sympathy.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 1, 2011 at 12:21am

On the second syllable "hat" I have not found any sensible clue. HPB left us a great riddle in fohat, among many other riddles, the solution of which is often very rewarding, in the area of wisdom and insight.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 1, 2011 at 9:15am

Ingmar, you referred to the Soothill and Hodous Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms, which gives Sanskrit equivalents when these are known. I am not able to consult this dictionary, because its entries are necessarily given in Chinese characters. In the entry you found for hunpo, does it give any Sanskrit equivalents? Although Chinese translations of Sanskrit terms were not standardized, like Tibetan ones were, it would still be helpful to get some idea of what Sanskrit term(s) might be equivalent to the Chinese po.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 1, 2011 at 9:51am

There is no Sanskrit equivalent given for **húnpò**, but the lemma for **hún** is

□ The mind, the soul, conscious mind, *vijñāna*; also □□.

I don't think vijñāna brings us any further though? You can see for yourself at page 430 [here](#).

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 1, 2011 at 12:31pm

I did not know that the Soothill/Hodous Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms was available online. If the first syllable, hun, means "The mind, the soul, conscious mind, *vijñāna*," this narrows down the meaning of the second syllable, po, to the second portions of this definition of hunpo: "Animus and anima; the spiritual nature or mind, and the animal soul; the two are defined as mind and body or mental and physical, the invisible soul inhabiting the visible body, the former being celestial, the latter terrestrial." That is, po would mean the anima, the animal soul, the body, the physical, the visible body, terrestrial. This meaning from Chinese Buddhist texts seems to be taking us farther from the meanings of fohat given by HPB and the Mahatmas. When HPB spoke of fohat as the animal soul, I understood this as being a manifestation of fohat, like physical electricity is, rather than as defining fohat. In any case, without a Chinese word "hat" to go with "po" in an applicable meaning, the word fohat still remains elusive.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 1, 2011 at 3:27pm

The principles of hun and po are apparently opposites in the philosophical model of man presented in the Golden Flower. (see below) HPB in CW IV 242-243 describes **hún** and **pò** (**Hwân** and **Pho**) as "soul, animus" and "animal soul, shell after death" respectively. This may correspond to the meaning of hún pò in Soothill, i.e. animus (hún) and anima (pò).

The definition of fohat as "cosmic kAma" may be a common factor in all other "manifestations", like electricity, the fiery whirlwind, etc. Essence of fohat may be that it is the entity behind all manifestations of **force** in the universe.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 1, 2011 at 3:54pm

In [CW X,254](#) (Transactions...) we find:

Q. Can you say what is the real meaning of the word Fohat?

A. The word is a Turanian compound and its meanings are various. In China Pho, or Fo, is the word for "animal soul," the vital Nephesh or the breath of life. Some say that it is derived from the Sanskrit "Bhu," meaning existence, or rather the essence of existence. Now Svâyambhû means Brahmâ and Man at the same time. It means self-existence and self-existing, that which is everlasting, the eternal breath. If Sat is the potentiality of Being, Pho is the potency of Being. The

meaning, however, entirely depends upon the position of the accent. Again, Fohat is related to Mahat. It is the reflection of the Universal Mind, [...]

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 1, 2011 at 4:41pm

Fohat is "Pho ba" or Phowa.

It has as I see it several meanings. And other meanings than "the transference of thought and consciousness, such as happens after death".

Tibetan-English-Dictionary of Buddhist Teaching & Practice:

pho ba --- {'**pho ba**, '**phos pa**, '**pho ba**} intr. v.; the transference of consciousness;

to transfer, shift, transit, transpose; transformation; **changing, emanating**, descent, ejection, dying, ejection of consciousness, transferring, to change place, shift.

the transformation at death into a higher realm of existence. ft. of {'pho ba};

transference of consciousness; to transfer/ shift; to transmit; **to enter [the heart]**;

to be transferred; 'pho baphowa, transference of consciousness; 'pho ba ejection of

consciousness A yogic practice in which consciousness leaves the body. One of the yogas of Naropa.;

'pho baphowa. Ejection of consciousness to a buddhafield at the moment of death.;

<http://www.diamondway-buddhism.org/default.asp?col=04&t=diction...>

(Bold added by me in the above.)

But, Fohat has other meanings no doubt.

I find the above to be the most precise definition of something "electric" or at least a

a LIFEFORCE, a propelling force, motion, the "ONE LIFE", Fohat is called the "Pervader", It is called in several Buddhist books Fohat. "Fohat" has several meanings.

--- It is Fohat who guides the transfer of the principles from one planet to the other, from one star to another—child-star.

--- "Daiviprakriti" is composed of Para-Sakti, Jnana-sakti, Itcha-sakti, Kriya-sakti, Kundalini-sakti and Mantrika-sakti.

--- Fohat—the energising and guiding intelligence.

(as mentioned by Blavatsky in SD, Vol. I, p. 109-112, 137, 139, 147, 292-293, and 493)

Just to throw a few extra ideas into it all.

M. Sufilight

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 1, 2011 at 5:44pm

You are no doubt right, Ingmar, in identifying the first syllable of fohat as the Chinese "po" (pinyin) or "p'o" (Wade-Giles) meaning "animal soul," if we follow what HPB said in the two references you gave, BCW X.354 (= Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge, p. 70) and BCW IV.242-243:

"The word is a Turanian compound and its meanings are various. In China Pho, of Fo, is the word for 'animal soul,' the vital Nephesh or the breath of life."

". . . the Pho or animal soul. At death the Hwan (or spiritual soul) wanders away, ascending, and the Pho (the root of the Tibetan word Pho-hat), descends and is changed into a ghostly shade (the shell)."

[As noted in my Nov. 12, 2010 post, this is from James Legge's Yi King, p. 355 fn.]

But when making these statements, was HPB speaking from knowledge or only making an educated guess? Apparently the latter. The passage from the Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge reads rather differently in the recently published fuller version, The Secret Doctrine Commentaries, pp. 138-143. On p. 142 we read:

"Moreover, you have to learn the etymology of the word Fohat. There is where it becomes difficult to understand. It is a Turanian compound word. 'Pho' is the word. 'Pho' was once and is derived from the Sanskrit 'bhu,' meaning existence, or rather the essence of existence. Now, 'Swayambhū' is Brahmā and man at the same time. 'Swayambhū' means self-existence and self-existing; it means also Manvantara. It means many, many things according to the sense in which you take it, and one must know exactly whether the accent is on the 'm' or on the 'u', or where it is, for therein lies the difference. Take 'bhu.' It means earth, our earth. Take 'Swayambhū.' It means divine breath, self-existence, that which is everlasting, the eternal breath. To this day in China, Buddha is called 'Pho.'"

As we see, in this version there is no mention of pho in China as animal soul, but on the contrary, pho in China is here Buddha. We know that there is a Chinese word "fo" meaning Buddha. Similarly, in BCW IV.18 HPB writes of "Amita-pho (pronounced Fo) or Amita-Buddha," footnoting this to Tibetan "pho," so that she is again taking pho as Buddha. It now stands at two references for pho as animal soul, Chinese "po," and two references for pho as Buddha, Chinese "fo." In the end, HPB states that she does not know. She was specifically asked for the Chinese characters for the word fohat in the full version of the Transactions. There on p. 363, as quoted here earlier (Nov. 14, 2010), we read:

"Mr. Atkinson: Is Fohat in the Chinese represented by two Chinese syllables?"

Mme. Blavatsky: It is from those parts something I have been asking many times. Fo means brilliant.

Mr. Atkinson: I know the root and the character of the Chinese syllable 'Fo.' If you could get the Chinese characters, I could turn it up in the Chinese dictionary.

Mme. Blavatsky: And in the Japanese, too. I don't think it is a real word, because some of them call it Fohat.

Mr. Atkinson: It would be 'Ho' in Japanese. And it would represent the idea of 'Ho,' as 'Ho' was a [] part of the phoenix. If it is the same as the Chinese, I mean. It becomes 'Ho' in Japanese, and then becomes the 'Ho' of the phoenix, as part of the compound name of the phoenix.

Mme. Blavatsky: Fohat is also a relation to the cycles, because the intensity of this vital force changes with every cycle.

Mr. Atkinson: It is in the celestial cosmogony of China. It is in the celestial beginning and the cosmogenesis.

Mme. Blavatsky: I wish you would look somewhere where you could find it, because I have been looking for it in India.

Mr. Atkinson: If you will only give me the Chinese characters, I will find it at once.

Mme. Blav

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 1, 2011 at 5:46pm

Repeating the last two lines, since the last was cut off:

Mr. Atkinson: If you will only give me the Chinese characters, I will find it at once.

Mme. Blavatsky: I have got it somewhere, but not in the Chinese."

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 1, 2011 at 5:58pm

Regarding fohat as Tibetan "pho ba" or phowa, to make this case, we have to find actual Tibetan texts in which this word is used in a sense like fohat. In the texts of the six yogas of Naropa, I do not see it used like fohat is used in Theosophical writings. I have not seen this word used in Tibetan cosmogonic accounts.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 1, 2011 at 9:09pm

On fohat and mahat, HPB discusses their relationship in the The Secret Doctrine Commentaries, pp. 426-427, saying that fohat is the collective radiation of the seven sons of mahat. The "hat" in the two words would not be the same, since mahat is Sanskrit, and fohat is not. Here is a rare case where tracing the word used, fohat, is proving harder than understanding the idea given, even though the idea is quite abstruse enough.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 2, 2011 at 3:37am

Thank you David: I had not read the passage from the Secret Doctrine Commentaries yet. It is certainly interesting!

There are many dead ends in HPB's etymological statements about fohat and fo. One example is the connection to **Potala**, or "Buddha-la". ([CW IV 11n](#)) Jäschke in his Tibetan-English dictionary (p. 325) states that the relation of Potala to Buddha "arises from an erroneous etymological hypothesis". He also mentions there, that this connection is found in the works of Abbé Huc. HPB cites Huc on more than one occasion. The po in Potala would according to Jäschke be related to Sanskrit pota "ship" and la, "harbour", and Buddha is of course derived from the Sanskrit root "budh", to know. They are both unrelated to our earlier Chinese syllable **po**. Of course this does not mean that there is no meaningful relation possible between these words, but in this case it would not be an etymological one, contrary to what HPB suggests.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 2, 2011 at 4:08am

Another link with more info.

Phowa and Pho ba

<http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Phowa>

No, I am not promoting Nyingmapa doctrines. But the above might be helpful in seeing that "**Pho ba**" or Foha, perhaps with esoterical intent changed to Fohat by Blavatsky, are related to the cycles, when transferring the bodies.

Blavatsky said: "It is called in several Buddhist books Fohat." --- and --- "Fohat" has several meanings.

(See Secret Doctrine Vol. I, p. 137 and 139.)

Since Fohat according to Blavatsky is mentioned in several books on Buddhism, It should not be that hard to find. Why would she tell a clear and visible untruth about something she gives so much emphasis? I just do not find that to be likely.

M. Sufilight

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 2, 2011 at 4:23am

Perhaps the following is worthwhile considering:

In Buddhistic cosmology Fohat is called something similar to Davi-Prakriti. Therefore I think we do not find **Pho ba** mentioned there in most texts on Cosmology, if any officially available at all. (See Secret Doctrine, Vol. I, p. 216). Fohat is cosmic intelligence. Blavatsky said: " life and electricity are one in our philosophy" (Transactions Blavatsky Lodge, p. 86) Daivi-Prakriti is one aspect of the triple Kwan-Shai-Yin (See Secret Doctrine Vol. I, p. 136) This might be helpful. But this is esoteric Buddhism and not the orthodox Buddhism, If I understand Blavatsky correctly.

Blavatsky said: "It is called in several Buddhist books Fohat." --- and --- "Fohat" has several meanings.

(See Secret Doctrine Vol. I, p. 137 and 139.)

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 2, 2011 at 7:35am

The Tibetan '[pho ba](#), "transference of consciousness", was also one of my plausible candidates for fohat. I have not been able to trace it beyond current Tibetan dictionaries. As far as I can see it is not related to the Chinese po.

It refers to more or less secretive techniques to induce altered states of consciousness, especially associated with the rnying ma order. I have not seen the term '**pho ba** referring to a philosophical principle on a cosmological scale, like fohat in the stanza's of Dzyan. Maybe this lead is worth more research though.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 2, 2011 at 9:20am

Ingmar, you obviously know some Chinese, and I don't. I have two questions for you on this.

First, when Mr. Atkinson was asking HPB about the Chinese characters for fohat, he said that he knew the Chinese character "fo," and said that: "It is in the celestial cosmogony of China. It is in the celestial beginning and the cosmogenesis." Do you know of any "fo" in Chinese cosmogony?

Second, you were giving the pinyin and Wade-Giles transcription for words from the Soothill/Hodous Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms. You then gave a link to an online version of it. Are the pinyin and Wade-Giles transcriptions available somewhere in the online version, or do you just have to know them?

Thanks.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 2, 2011 at 1:26pm

"Blavatsky said: "It is called in several Buddhist books Fohat."" T. Subba Row makes the same statement, but he obviously never saw any of the Tibetan books that it is supposed to be in. Probably HPB did not, either. Both of them simply repeated what they heard from their Mahatma teachers. While such a word could well be in secret Tibetan books that we do not have access to, it is quite unlikely that fohat is found in the known Tibetan books. However close we may get to a Tibetan (or Chinese) word for the first syllable, we still have to account for the second syllable, hat. No one has been able to do this, despite checking extensive Tibetan dictionaries, such as the comprehensive 3-volume Tibetan-Tibetan dictionary published in China in 1984. I wonder if fohat is simply a term adopted by the Mahatmas from some other language, and used by them in their discussion of this idea with their chelas.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 2, 2011 at 2:18pm

David, as to your first question: I have here in my notes a short list of Chinese syllables I have been looking into, ranging from fo, fu, fou, to po, pho, pa, pha etc. The only **fo** in my list is fo2, for Buddha or Buddhist, which is a phonetic rendering of the Sanskrit budh or bu. ([CW IV 18](#) and [V 288](#))

For all HPB's statements in the CW on the various syllables connected to fohat, I have more or less systematically been tracing their connections and history if possible. When I was trying to learn some Tibetan, I have familiarized myself with using Chinese dictionaries, etymological databases etc. I imagine there will be people online, or even on this forum, who have real knowledge in the area of **Chinese language and philosophy**, who could shed much more light on the subject, to which they are of course cordially invited!

As to Wade-Giles and pinyin: I have a made a handy table [here](#).

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 2, 2011 at 3:00pm

Yes.

H. P. Blavatsky wrote in "REINCARNATIONS IN TIBET":

"The valley of the Ganges where Buddha preached and lived is also called "Phag-yul," the holy, spiritual land; the word phag coming from the one root—Pha or Pho being the corruption of Fo (or Buddha), as the Tibetan alphabet contains no

letter F."

.....

"* In Tibetan pho and pha—pronounced with a soft labial breath-like sound—means at the same time “man, father.” So pha-yul is native land; pho-nya, angel, messenger of good news; pha-me, ancestors, etc."

([CW IV page 11 + 18](#))

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 2, 2011 at 3:54pm

Search on "Phat" gives:

"pha ta - phat The combination of the syllable 'pha' that is 'gathering means' and the letter 't' that is 'cutting knowledge'./ The syllable of knowledge and means [RY]"

<http://www.ryan.moralhazards.com/english-tibetan-dictionary/phat/>

Search on "Pho ba" gives (and this is only one version of several):

"pho ba - 90 minute period, change, transform, transfer, transmigration, change place, go, move oneself away, migrate, depart, shift, descent, ejection, alter, SA spo ba, meditation on transferring the consciousness, movement, **cycle of breaths, force of the breath**, flowing of the breath [JV]"

<http://www.ryan.moralhazards.com/english-tibetan-dictionary/pho%20ba/>

Search on "Pha" gives (and this is one more versions):

"2) aspect of upaya father, beyond, onward, farther on-nus"

<http://www.ryan.moralhazards.com/english-tibetan-dictionary/pha/>

Search on "bla" gives:

"bla - 1) over above, before, upper part, superior, higher; 2) astr life support, bla gnas, B"n: soul, life energy, vital principle, energy (the basis/ support for life force and life span, vital basis; 3) suitable, sufficient bzod pa [IW]"

(Fohat is then - **Pho-bla-t** ? I do not know. I am only a "Peling". Smile.)

(Bold added. Upaya = non-dual and other meanings.)

If the letter "t" implies "cutting knowledge", I think we have Pho ba = "Cutting knowledge of force of the breath" and other similar versions.

I wonder if this also explains other of Blavatsky's uses of the letter "t".

Blavatsky said: "It is called in several Buddhist books Fohat." --- and --- "Fohat" has several meanings.

(See Secret Doctrine Vol. I, p. 137 and 139.).

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 3, 2011 at 3:18am

Thanks for your interesting contribution Anna. The **Po (no. 23)** and **Huan (no. 59)** entries in the I Ching are different Chinese characters than our earlier **húnpò** but that may not completely prove that they are unrelated.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 3, 2011 at 5:00am

In addition to my earlier remark on the connection between fohat and **fó**, "Buddha": Buddhism came to China in the 7th c. AD. The syllable **fó** would have been derived from Sanskrit in the Middle Chinese period, and would then not be "Turanian" i.e. Old Chinese. The syllable **fó** was derived from the MC word **bhiêtdha**, which is quite different from po, pho etc.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 3, 2011 at 10:28am

Here in this blog discussion, we are trying to trace the origins of the Stanzas of Dzyan. This necessarily means tracing them in known sources, which would be outside of the Theosophical writings. If a unique word found in the Stanzas, such as fohat, can be traced to known sources, this may help us in identifying the origins of the Stanzas.

The etymologies given by HPB for fohat would presumably provide our best leads as to where to look in outside sources. Some of these have led to actual words that can be found in Chinese and Tibetan sources. Others are examples of what modern scholars politely call "creative" etymologies. That is, linguistically speaking, they are impossible etymologies. They represent popular etymologies that are sometimes used by the people, like stories and myths, to make particular associations, and even these associations may or may not be valid.

With reference to the quote from "Reincarnations in Tibet": The Tibetan word "phag pa" (phags pa) is the standard translation of the Sanskrit word "ārya" used throughout the Tibetan Buddhist canonical writings. This is easily and quickly verifiable by anyone who checks the Sanskrit originals in comparison with the canonical Tibetan translations. The word "phag-yul" (phags [pa'i] yul) does indeed refer to the "holy land," since it literally translates the Sanskrit "ārya-deśa," the land of the āryas; i.e., India. For Tibetans, India is the holy land, because it is the source of the Buddhist teachings. These teachings fill the Tibetan Buddhist canon, the Kangyur and Tengyur, in the form of hundreds of volumes of scriptures that were translated from the sacred language of India, Sanskrit.

The word "phag," which in its full transliterated spelling is phags (to be distinguished from phag, meaning "pig"), does not, and cannot, come from the root "pha" or "pho," linguistically speaking. Tibetan is what was called in HPB's day an agglutinative language (SD 2.199). In these languages, words are either single morphemes, or are formed from morphemes placed together, but not

merged with each other. So there is not, and cannot be, any root such as "pha" or "pho" that makes the word "phag."

Nor would the Tibetan words "pha" or "pho," meaning "father" and "male," be corruptions of the Chinese word "fo," meaning "Buddha." These are two different languages. There is no more evidence that Tibetan "pho" is based on Chinese "fo" than that English "pig" is based on Tibetan "phag." We will have to leave aside these "creative" etymologies in our search.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 3, 2011 at 10:46am

Thank you, Ingmar, for the link to your helpful table of Chinese transliterations in the Wade-Giles and pinyin systems.

I do not know about the different periods of the Chinese language, but there is historical evidence that Buddhism came to China in the first century CE, and traditional accounts that it arrived two or three centuries earlier than that. There are a number of Sanskrit Buddhist texts that were translated into Chinese in the second century CE, including the famous Perfection of Wisdom in 8,000 lines. I do not know if "fo" for Buddha was used in these early translations.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 3, 2011 at 11:44am

The words that we can associate with the "fo" of "fohat" do not play a role in cosmogonic accounts, like fohat does in the Stanzas of Dzyan. Another approach to this question can be taken. In cosmogonic accounts, such as in Tibetan Buddhism, what word holds a similar place or what idea performs a similar function? Earlier here I have suggested that the Sanskrit word *prabhāsvara*, "luminosity," Tibetan 'od gsal, "clear light," does, and I translated a small but important group of four verses on this by Āryadeva (Jan. 23, 2011). This leads me to two suggestions.

First, there are now many books out on Tibetan Buddhism, far more than I can read. The term "clear light" should be watched for in any readings of these books that any of you may do. If anything relevant to the meaning of fohat is found, please post it here.

Second, the term *prabhāsvara* occurs in a famous passage of the Perfection of Wisdom in 8,000 lines, in its first chapter. It is: *tac cittam acittam, prakṛtiś cittasya prabhāsvarā*, literally, "that mind is no-mind; the nature of mind is luminosity." This passage is quoted in the *Vimala-prabhā Kālacakra* commentary (Sanskrit edition, vol. 1, p. 23, lines 12-13), and also in the modern book by the present Dalai Lama titled *Dzogchen*, p. 126. It would be useful to find out what the Chinese translation of *prabhāsvara* is. Perhaps its early translation in the *Aṣṭa-sāhasrikā Prajñā-pāramitā* in the second century CE differs from its later translation, where it is found often in the *Ratna-gotra-vibhāga*.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 4, 2011 at 2:09am

David Reigle wrote:

"The word "phag," which in its full transliterated spelling is phags (to be distinguished from phag, meaning "pig"), does not, and cannot, come from the root "pha" or "pho," linguistically speaking. Tibetan is what was called in HPB's day an agglutinative language (SD 2.199). In these languages, words are either single morphemes, or are formed from morphemes placed together, but not merged with each other. So there is not, and cannot be, any root such as "pha" or "pho" that makes the word "phag.""

H. P. Blavatsky wrote in "REINCARNATIONS IN TIBET":

"The valley of the Ganges where Buddha preached and lived is also called "Phag-yul," the holy, spiritual land; the word phag coming from the one root—Pha or Pho being the corruption of Fo (or Buddha), as the Tibetan alphabet contains no letter F."

.....

"* In Tibetan pho and pha—pronounced with a soft labial breath-like sound—means at the same time "man, father." So pha-yul is native land; pho-nya, angel, messenger of good news; pha-me, ancestors, etc."

([CW IV page 11 + 18](#))

Somehow I find the above two quotes to oppose each other.

Is **phag** coming from the one root—**Pha** or **Pho** being the corruption of **Fo** (or Buddha) as Blavatsky said or not?

Can we have a clarification of which one is the correct version and why?

I find that Blavatsky merged various morphemes with each other when translating them to English. Perhaps because that was custom at the time. And that she also from time to time translated the sound of the words instead of the actual spelling. Tibetan was as far as I understand it not translated fully in the 1880-ties. And Blavatsky used various words in a veiled manner so to provoke the intuition, which was a part of the aim with the Secret Doctrine. But, these are just my views.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 4, 2011 at 2:29am

Search for "Phag" gives:

phag - 1) hidden. 2) sow, swine, hog, pig [RY]

phag - 1) concealed, secret, hidden part, interstice; 2) behind; 3) pig, hog, pig; 4) bricks [IW]

phag - swine [RY]

phag - swine, hog, pig [in the manner of a pig who eats everything without discerning purity and impurity, are the discipline and conduct of sameness, without accepting and rejecting the five sacramental substances - sgo phag crack in a door bag ma'i phag- embrace of the bride [IW]

phag - pig, that which is hidden or secret, that which lies in between, hidden part, interstice, 1 of 12 dus tshod [JV]

<http://www.ryan.moralhazards.com/english-tibetan-dictionary/Phag/>

The word Buddha when used by Blavatsky and others was and is not always referring to the founder of Buddhism, but to the highest state of enlightenment. A *secret or hidden state*, a state empty of attributes outside time.

It has been said many times, that the initiated mystics sometimes played with words, and twisted them a bit. Sometimes deliberately, so to veil the teachings to the "unworthy", and thereby keep the teachings from being destroyed by the tyrants etc.

H. P. Blavatsky wrote:

"I can assure the Western Pandits that these manuscripts and folios could never be understood even by a born Tibetan without a key (a) to their peculiar characters, and (b) to their hidden meaning. In our system every description of locality is figurative, every name and word purposely veiled; and one has first to study the mode of deciphering and then to learn the equivalent secret terms and symbols for nearly every word of the religious language. The Egyptian enchorial or hieratic system is child's play to our sacerdotal puzzles."

http://www.katinkahesselink.net/blavatsky/articles/v14/mb_007.htm

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 4, 2011 at 8:39am

"Is **phag** coming from the one root—**Pha** or **Pho** being the corruption of **Fo** (or Buddha) as Blavatsky said or not?

Can we have a clarification of which one is the correct version and why?"

In agglutinative languages like Tibetan, words are not made from roots like they are in the languages of the Indo-European family. While making phag from pha makes perfect sense in an Indo-European language, it is not possible in Tibetan. There the morphemes stay the same, and two separate morphemes may be placed together to make additional words, but not merged together into one morpheme to make additional words.

For example, from the Tibetan morpheme "shes," meaning "to know," the word "shes rab" can be made, meaning "wisdom," or the word "shes pa" can be made, meaning "known." You see that "shes" remains unchanged, and separate syllables are added to it to make additional words. In Indo-European languages such as English and Sanskrit, this is done by merging or fusing elements together. Thus, as we see, we can get English "known" from "know." In Sanskrit,

from the root jñā, "to know" (Tib. shes) we can make prajñā, "wisdom" (Tib. shes rab), or jñāta, "known" (Tib. shes pa). But in Tibetan, we cannot make phag from pha.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on November 4, 2011 at 9:02am

On a quick reading in Schmidt I did also not find the quote. But will read slowly again and also check Wassilew.

On Fohat, Purucker says this:

<http://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/soph/sopqa14.htm#meaningoffohat>

The scan is here:

<http://books.google.de/books?id=8O4EwZ6pxJEC&pg=PA527&lpg=P...>

*An Invitation to The Secret Doctrine
a Glossary of Terms Kirby Van Mater:*

<http://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/invit-sd/invsd-gl.htm>

"Fohat (Turanian compound, fr Mongolian *pho, fo*, "buddha, buddhi") The cause or essence of cosmic vitality or electricity, divine ideative energy of the universe."

Comment by [Olga Stolyarchik](#) on November 4, 2011 at 5:39pm

Astral-traveling. Initiations. Awareness before and after Awakening. Research and study #44.

Mana. Mind- Ego. Kama. Discipline and Control.

When Ego become a Higher Ego, It is not the same as Mind becomes Mana. Higher Ego is still can be influenced by Kama, which is a "by-product" in the Astral World system.

Simplified I can explain like: When Mind become too busy and Its only interested to find out how to become a Mana on Higher level ,which is understandable, and It is should be like that as part of the Evolution.

But Ego at the same time is a victim of Kama. Kama become more sophisticated and sneaky chameleon and can turn Ego under Its will. And what it does in practice could fail to evolve. Ego taking a "Napoleon Complex" and Its process of rapid sophistication can become a self-manifestation. This is highly against the Law of the Divine, a morale crime, with much bigger punishment because its shouldn't happening with one who is Awake and evolve.

If this is happened a Higher Mind must know better and remember all that It can from a wisdom of Mahatma about Control and Discipline. And take Ego and

teaches a lesson to never ever do this again and since of the awareness, always be in full control over Ego and watch out for Kama that is always up to something, not good.

No matter how much Higher Mind enjoyed transformation, there is very important part must never forget. As long as being a human, if interacting with regular people in city environment living, Kama will try to infect through Ego into Higher Mind with its germ. This germ spreads in "Earthy belongings" and will be holding down the whole process of the Evolution.

All this corresponded from personal experience and this is latest episode will explain what has happened. Exercising my Mind by writing quotes after Mahatma Gandhi and this is the last one of "Top 10 Fundamentals For Changing The World"

The lesson

10. Development

"Constant development is the law of life, and a man who always tries to maintain his dogmas in order to appear consistent drives himself into a false position."

Mahatma Gandhi

THE SOUL DEVELOPMENT ALWAYS SHOULD BE MOVING UP AND EVOLVE.
DEVELOPMENT IS A WHEELS IN THE LAW OF LIFE AND A VEHICLE FOR THE EVOLUTION.

I wrote.

I want to apologize to a Great Master Mahatma Gandhi for being so foolish while written these quotes after his words of wisdom on "10 Fundamentals" A Higher Mind confirmed Ego being such foolish and make me understand that this is my lesson about Control. I skip that Fundamental # 3 before. I wrote nothing there because I had no knowledge of how to control. Thank you Great Master for showing me how to control my Ego with my Higher Mind. Ego may become very intelligent and after spiritual awakening, become Higher Ego in action. But if Higher Mind is not know how to control Ego, Ego could and will proceed further not only forgetting common sense, but unstoppable then, able to continue on wrong and dangerous path leading future Mana to nowhere but to fail. But I got it, Thank You Master for teaching me today what was wrong and so simple and possible to do. And this is what I did to correct the mistake I told my Ego hold it! Sure, it is incredible to see the ability to write own wisdom quotes after Mahatma Gandhi and to be proud of every quote on Fundamentals, because each one I wrote is true wisdom, meant from the heart and personal experience, which after the Enli

Comment by [Olga Stolyarchik](#) on November 4, 2011 at 5:48pm

I am sorry it is too long and I have to post the rest of it with second posting. Apologize for the inconvenience.

Here is the last part of the posting. Excuse my English language errors. Hope is readable.

.....which after the Enlighten Higher Mind be able to recognize the way it should be. But what this is all about? Writing in Capital letters as I am become on the same or as Ego catches at the moment of such a Glory even to be something more, wise bigger??? And my Higher Mind said: O, no, no you not! You are so wrong to even think that for a second. I have the control to be able recognize when my Ego in the moment of personal achievement clouded by victory and acting such a foolish, thinking It is bigger and wiser that Its Teacher. A Great Master who is teaches Ego to become Higher. I am a Higher Mind, who is in control of my Ego action. I can stop It at anytime I believe It is wrong and I will! (this is become a missing quote on #3 of the Fundamentals. Control)

At the conclusion I would like to say of my full respect to the Master:

Please forgive O Great Master! I am sorry for my Ego foolishness and in the future I will be at more serious lookout, for-see that and stop it before Ego make a mistake.

WE ARE LEARNING FROM OUR MISTAKES. ALL OUR MISTAKES SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED. PAST MISTAKES -WHEN WE GROW OLDER AND WISER, AND THEN WE MUST AVOID A NEW MISTAKES. BUT IF SUCH THING HAPPENS, WHEN WE ARE AWAKE – RECOGNITION IS PART OF OUR WISDOM.

EVERY MISTAKE IF NOT RECOGNIZED WILL BECOME SOMETHING ELSE, AND SOMETHING ELSE WILL BE PARTIALLY OR FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FAILURE...

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 5, 2011 at 6:30am

Thank you very much, Frank, for checking Schmidt's 1829 book for the Bodhimor quote. I really do appreciate this. Perhaps it is in one of Schmidt's other books that you kindly gave us links to. He seems to be the only one in the 1800s who quoted the Bodhimor.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 6, 2011 at 1:15pm

On the quote of De Purucker below. The Mongolian etymology of fohat is unfortunately also a dead end. Mongolian (Altai-Uralic) language is not related to Tibetan and Chinese (Sino-Tibetan), so words cannot be of Tibetan or Chinese as well as Mongolian origin. In the Mongolian alphabet, there is no letter f, and for that reason the "verbal root" ***foh** will not be found in any Mongolian dictionary. The Chinese fo (Buddha) is known to be derived from the Sanskrit root bud,

which makes it Indo-European, and therefore not directly related to Altai-Uralic or Sino-Tibetan. Maybe we could look for relations beyond these language families, but just calling it Mongolian is certainly false.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 6, 2011 at 2:33pm

For our purposes here in this search, the problem with any Theosophical definition of fohat that ascribes it to Tibetan, Mongolian, Chinese, or Turanian is that none of these Theosophical writers have ever seen it in any of those languages. They have merely repeated this from some source that they take as authoritative. There is little harm in doing this as long as their audience is only other Theosophists. But for the rest of the world, this word would have to actually exist in one of those languages, and be able to be found in texts written in that language. Otherwise, it is in their eyes just one more of HPB's fantasies, like the Book of Dzyan itself. Theosophical writers who say it is in one of those languages, where no one can find it, do not help the cause of Theosophy in the eyes of the world. So until fohat is found, we will have to regard it as unidentified. Theosophists are free to learn those languages and join in the search for it. There is a real need for this.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on November 6, 2011 at 6:14pm

The Bodhimor was also quoted in a book written by J.J. Bochinger and published in 1831. The title is : "La vie contemplative, ascétique et monastique chez les hindous et chez les peuples bouddhistes", and the quote (translated) is : "Around 800, a chinese lama, named Hoshang Mahadjana (named l'Ascian by Georgi), came from China to Tibet, and set up a sect, that Georgi called the sect of the contemplators and also Kiupa (Georgi). **The Bodhimör, a tibetan book**, ascribe to this lama the division of the lamas in two sects, the sTon-min, and the T'semin.

But nothing else of interest for our quest showed up in this book.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 6, 2011 at 10:57pm

Chinese renderings of Sanskrit prabhāsvara / Tibetan 'od gsal

□□ qīng jìng

□□ guāng míng bright (future); promising

□ míng clear; bright; to understand;

next; ...

明净 míng jìng bright and clean; luminous

清静
清静 qīng jìng
xiàng

list of individual characters

清 qīng (or qìng) clear, pure, clean; peaceful

净 jìng clean, pure; cleanse

光 guāng light, brilliant, shine; only

明 míng clear; bright; to understand; next; ...

相 xiàng appearance, look; ...

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 6, 2011 at 11:15pm

Some simple tools for looking up Chinese words or characters can be found at <http://www.mandarintools.com> Having identified the characters or words, we could use specialized dictionaries to identify/confirm the technical (philosophical, religious, etc.) terms.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on November 7, 2011 at 10:28am

Dear Ingmar,

=>On the quote of De Purucker below. The Mongolian etymology of fohat is unfortunately also a dead end.

Probably. But probably it might be an occult hint?

=>Mongolian (Altai-Uralic) language is not related to Tibetan and Chinese (Sino-Tibetan), so words cannot be of Tibetan or Chinese as well as Mongolian origin. In the Mongolian alphabet, there is no letter f,

yes, in the Mongolian as we know it in alphabetic rendering. But what about Ur-Mongolian before the letters?

Up to the 5th century AD the Germans had runes instead of letters.

=>The Chinese fo (Buddha) is known to be derived from the Sanskrit root bud, which makes it Indo-European

The word Dalai in Dalai Lama is also been said as of Mongolian origin. And the Dalai Lama is said as to be an incarnation of the Buddha. And the German chronologist Johann August Egenolff writes in his "Historie der Teutschen Sprache" (History of the German language), Leipzig 1735, that Odin came from Asia to Moscow [the Moscva river, as all river names in the world in Asia, Europe and the Americas being of German origin according to Erhard Landmann's "Weltbilderschütterung" (Crash of the world view), see:

pdf: <http://www.kostenlose-buecher.eu/doc/57936/landmann-erhard-weltbilde...>

printed book: <http://franken-buecher.de/weltbilderschutterungdierichtigeentzifferu...>

Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MGxzKdh1M18>]

Landmann's language research was pioneered in 1663 by Justus Georg Schottelius "Ausführliche Arbeit von der teutschen Haubtsprache" (Detailed work on the German root language), who also comes to the conclusion as in modern times Tingley chela Kenneth Morris, that the German language is the key to solve historical riddles and the development of the races.

But back to Odin, according to Egenolff. He went from Moscow to Saxony, then to Midnight (the Harz mountains with the famous and lay line heathen Externsteine stones, a power spot until today, was called by the ancients the Mitternacht mountain), then to an "Odinsey" island near Finland. Here we have the Grec fable of Odysseus or Ulysses, a combination of Odin and Zeus. HPB hints to an occult connection between Asia and Finland.

Interesting to know that according to HPB in her SD, vol. II, Odin was one of the 35 historical Buddhas. Now, one of the epithets of the Gautama Buddha is Sakya muni. Two clear German words: Sakya = Saxony and muni = monk, which is: Buddha, the monk from Saxony. Moreover, the present 14th Dalai Lama in a Harvard lecture (1993 German edition) once revealed that there exists in the Tibetan culture an old legend from the Buddha himself, who foretold in India, that there will come a time, when human beings come to Lhasa, which was a sea at the Buddha's time. He declared that the Buddha's prophecy was fulfilled with the arrival of the two German SS men Heinrich Harrer and Peter Aufschnaiter during WWII - 4,000 years later!

In Hitler's occult bureau researchers believed that there is an old mystic connection between Tibet and Germany. When the SS expedition in 1938 arrived in the forbidden city and the Tibetans made ecstasy dances and celebrated them as they saw the German Swastika flag - as if they met lost, old brethren.

Also of interest may be to Blavatsky students that the first leader of the Theosophical Movement, Blavatsky, is said to be of German origin from her father's side. And the fourth

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on November 7, 2011 at 10:30am

Part 2, sorry

continued from below...

Also of interest may be to Blavatsky students that the first leader of the Theosophical Movement, Blavatsky, is said to be of German origin from her father's side. And the fourth leader, von Purucker, is also said to be of German origin from his father's side (Franks tribe). He was an adept of 6th initiation and tulku to a Tibetan Lama - while while one of the Masters, K.H., who helped much in HPB's work, especially with European thought, served as master of ceremonies in Tibet.

=>but just calling it Mongolian is certainly false.

Maybe. But probably de Purucker (if the quote is really from him and was not foisted on him posthumously) speaks of primordial Mongolian language thousands or hundred thousands of years back?

I agree with David that repeating of hearsay is not enough and we must find the sources. Perhaps this is the homework HPB had in mind for us.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 7, 2011 at 11:51am

It is great to see that research is proceeding, in French, German, and Chinese sources, no less.

Thank you, Jacques, for posting the results of your search on the Bodhimor. It is interesting that J. J. Bochinger quoted the Bodhimor in a French book from 1831. Even though it is not the quote we are seeking, it pushes our research ahead. I think it is very likely that HPB got her Bodhimor quote from a published source. All we have to do is find it.

Thank you, Ingmar, for tracing the Chinese translations of the Sanskrit term prabhasvara for us. The phonetic transcriptions you found make it clear that this is not the term "fohat" that we are seeking. It was certainly worth checking, from the standpoint of its meaning. Each term we rule out also advances our research.

Thank you, Frank, for the input from German sources. A very old form of Mongolian, no longer used, or of any other Asian language, would indeed be a possibility for the source of the word fohat. These almost put it in the realm of Senzar, and make it nearly impossible to trace in known texts. Nonetheless, we must continue our search until all known possibilities are ruled out.

Yes, our homework is cut out for us.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 7, 2011 at 12:00pm

Yes, Anna, I will try to say why there is a need for Theosophists to learn Eastern languages to search for Theosophical terms such as fohat. The immediate reason is twofold. First, only a small percentage of the Eastern texts have been translated into English. Second, there is no standardization of translation terminology used in the translations we do have, so that we often do not know what is behind the English terms we read in them. I will illustrate this shortly. The broader reason, relevant to this discussion, is that tracing specific Theosophical terms to specific Eastern texts will help us in trying to trace the origins of the Stanzas of Dzyan.

Why do we want to do that? As students of Theosophy, we want to follow the path shown in *The Voice of the Silence*, of placing the welfare of others ahead of our own welfare. We believe that the Theosophical teachings have much to contribute to the welfare of our neighbors; teachings such as the ideal of brotherhood, the teaching of karma that fosters individual responsibility for our actions, the teaching of reincarnation that counters the fear of death, the teaching that the different religions and philosophies of the world have their roots in a once universal Wisdom Tradition, so that there is no need for religious

conflict, etc. But these potentially beneficial Theosophical teachings reach only a tiny percentage of humanity. The primary reason for this, in my view, is that Blavatsky is regarded by most of the world as an imposter and a charlatan, and the Stanzas of Dzyan that form the basis of her major book, The Secret Doctrine, are regarded as figments of her imagination. Therefore, these teachings are not taken seriously by most of the world. This is why we are here trying to trace the Stanzas in known texts, and this is why there is a need for Theosophists to know Eastern languages.

Now, to the illustration. The "great breath" is taught as one of the two aspects under which we conceive the one inconceivable principle that is the first fundamental proposition of the Secret Doctrine. We search in vain for the "great breath" in the known Eastern scriptures. At last, we find this distinctive term in the Kalachakra texts, not yet translated into English. This term as used there goes back to the Manjusri-nama-samgiti. Among the Sanskrit editions of the Manjusri-nama-samgiti just posted here in the Online Sanskrit Texts Project, the 1981 edition gives an English translation. Its verse 29 is there translated as: "Aspirated, unoriginated, without uttering a sound, he is the foremost cause of all expression, shining forth within all speech." This is from a good translation by a competent scholar. Yet from it, we have no clue that this verse contains the term mahā-prāṇa, the "great breath," because this term is here translated as "aspirated."

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 7, 2011 at 2:19pm

I think maybe we could distinguish **two approaches** the problem of the "Origin of the Stanza's", the problem being "What are the Stanzas of Dzyan? Where did they come from and where can they be found today?". Each of these will have its own pitfalls.

1. Finding technical terms in known sources

This could involve

- Listing the places where respective technical terms are used in the works of HPB
- Following HPB's references to sources of her time
- Finding out orthography and identifying terms in modern sources
- Studying sources where terms are found, searching for other unidentified terms

2. Finding the concepts behind the technical terms in various schools of thought

This could involve

- Following HPB's references and hints to various schools of thought
- Studying sources on these schools
- Identifying concepts characteristic to the schools
- Comparing tenet systems to the ancient wisdom as presented by HPB
- Identifying geographical and historical footprints of the schools
- Finding terms corresponding to these concepts in the languages within the footprints
- Studying sources and languages where terms are found, searching for other unidentified terms

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 8, 2011 at 7:55am

Dear friends

My views are:

Maybe the following could be helpful...

"Foh" is Buddha in Chinese. And if I am not mistaken, we also have that "Fa Hua" is Buddha in Chinese. And with "dialects" or twisting the words a bit we can find "Fa Hua" is "Fo Hua" or twisting it to western eyes and the non-standard translations of the 1880-ties we have "Fo-hua-t". And "Huo" is "fire" in Chinese. Because esoteric teachings are not primarily given in the dead-letter. I think we are a bit closer to the word Fohat or Pho-ba or Pho-bla-t.

Any comments on the above?

- There are for instance more than a hundred languages and dialects in the Yunnan province to choose from. And that is only a minor part of China. And the Yunnan province is close to the place called *Shan-Gri-La* County in China, not that far from "Arunachal Pradesh" in India. There are several manuscripts in the Yunnan Province using various pictographic scripts (and thereby ideograms. Blavatsky mentioned that Dzyan Stanzas was written by the use of ideograms and coded etc.). More than 90.000 glyphs has been discovered in the Yunnan area. The origin of the scripts have been dated to the middle ages or so. Now saying that this is the only place where pictographic scripts have existed in China in the very old days seem a bit unlikely to me.

Now I am no scholar. But the following seems interesting to consider "Origin of the Chinese Script":

<http://www.chinavista.com/experience/hanzi/hanzi.html>M. Sufilight

(The Dawenkou Culture is a bit central here. There are other views than given in the link.)

- It seems that there still exists some very rare (difficult to access) Kalachakra Tantra manuscripts in the area called Kham in China. But verification is needed. And since there are thousands of commentaries to the Kalachakra Tantra, not all are known to the official eye, - we cannot just like that say that Blavatsky was incorrect in her views. If so, I will call that a non-scientific point of view. (The Initiates have their secrets. And for good reasons, if I may say so. So if they do not openly reveal it all, they might have their reasons. Seek psychological change first is the word going out. When we change psychologically the secrets will be known. - I claim I know it. And others do so as well. Yes, true, we can claim all we want...Does it help? ...Perhaps.)

Transliteration schemes was as far as I know it not very well developed in the 1880-ties. **Blavatsky said in her book the Secret Doctrine, that the word "Fohat" could be found in several Buddhistic writings. And that the word Fohat had several meanings. - So it must be easy to find this word.** - Do you not think so?

(But of course not using a dead-letter mind when doing it. - The sound of the words and morphemes can be read and not always in the ordinary order. Just like when reading Sanskrit. Words or morphemes can and do change place and form and meaning in a sentence, when reading in an esoteric manner. - Anagrams looms in the horizon to the Seekers reading using the 7 keys to the Mystery Language. Sometimes a word is twisted a bit and given a different meaning. The esoteric texts contain several layers of reading modes. If you are stuck with only one layer you have probably overlooked something very important - especially if the texts was written by an Arhan or Master in the old days. TianXia said the Emperor of Qin in the legend and movie named Hero when reading the sign offered him by the leading character "Nameless". It means: "All (everything and everyone) under heaven". And peace came to China in the old days. Let us seek peace again. - Words have vibrations and they put energies in motion. Therefore when writing this has to be taken into account with an understanding of the cycles of time - and the future readers of the texts. Th

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 8, 2011 at 8:06am

The previous post by me in this thread was cut short...In the below are the rest of it.

Dear friends
My views are:

"If you are stuck with only one layer you have probably overlooked something

very important - especially if the texts was written by an Arhan or Master in the old days. TianXia said the Emperor of Qin in the legend and movie named Hero when reading the sign offered him by the leading character "Nameless". It means: "All (everything and everyone) under heaven". And peace came to China in the old days. Let us seek peace again. - Words have vibrations and they put energies in motion. Therefore when writing this has to be taken into account with an understanding of the cycles of time - and the future readers of the texts. The Wheel of time. - But these are just my humble views. And I am not claiming to be a Master.)

Since I am not educated in Tibetan or Chinese at the moment - I rely on my extra sensory perception and the reading of Akasha. When words are written using Transliteration it helps me a lot, because I read or sense the "sound and structure" in Akasha. I sense without having read the book and commentaries to it, that The Root Kalachakra Tantra on the Seven (or Eleven) Initiations (written in Tibetan, Sanskrit and Mongolian and --- perhaps also Chinese?) contain in it - or - in one or more commentaries to it - the use of words which translate to either "breath", "life force", "fire", "heat", "light" or similar words with regard to Fohat given by Blavatsky in the Secret Doctrine. If these words are researched in the texts and commentaries - and their dead-letter form twisted a bit - then I think one may find the words like pho-hat or fo-hua and FOHAT is not far away. But I might be mistaken since I do not have the texts with me or access to them or the (female) commentaries. I rely on my inner sense of Akasha about this. And it is not quite reliable, to say it mildly. - If this is helpful, please let me know. (Let us not forget that Blavatsky mentioned the seven initiations in the Secret Doctrine. And this is as I see it a clear indication pointing to the Kalachakra Tantra teachings - when taking the cosmological teachings into account. See Secret Doctrine, Vol. I, p. 206 - "Three further higher grades have to be conquered by the Arhan who would reach the apex of the ladder of Arhatship").

I repeat the below just in case...

H. P. Blavatsky wrote:

"I can assure the Western Pandits that these manuscripts and folios could never be understood even by a born Tibetan without a key (a) to their peculiar characters, and (b) to their hidden meaning. In our system every description of locality is figurative, every name and word purposely veiled; and one has first to study the mode of deciphering and then to learn the equivalent secret terms and symbols for nearly every word of the religious language. The Egyptian enchorial or hieratic system is child's play to our sacerdotal puzzles."

http://www.katinkahesselink.net/blavatsky/articles/v14/mb_007.htm

H. P. Blavatsky wrote in "REINCARNATIONS IN TIBET":

"The valley of the Ganges where Buddha preached and lived is also called "Phag-yul," the holy, spiritual land; the word phag coming from the one root—Pha or Pho being the corruption of Fo (or Buddha), as the Tibetan alphabet contains no letter F."

.....

"* In Tibetan pho and pha—pronounced with a soft labial breath-like sound—means at the same time “man, father.” So pha-yul is native land; pho-nya, angel, messenger of good news; pha-me, ancestors, etc."
(CW IV page 11 + 18)

The Secret Doctrine by Blavatsky was written to the more advanced students, and not with the primary aim of being read in a dead-letter manner. And Blavatsky wrote about this in the book. Sometimes it seems that this is forgotten a bit.

All the above are just my views.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 8, 2011 at 1:35pm

The two approaches that you outlined, Ingmar, I think are well put: finding technical terms in known sources, and finding the concepts behind the technical terms in various schools of thought. Your outline could serve as the guidelines for the research in this project.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 8, 2011 at 2:07pm

M. Sufilight wrote:

"Transliteration schemes was as far as I know it not very well developed in the 1880-ties. **Blavatsky said in her book the Secret Doctrine, that the word "Fohat" could be found in several Buddhist writings. And that the word Fohat had several meanings. - So it must be easy to find this word.** - Do you not think so?"

It has not been easy for me to find this word. But perhaps it will be easy for someone else to find it. The Tibetan alphabet has only thirty letters, which can quickly be learned. Thousands of Tibetan books are now available online, through the Asian Classics Input Project, and the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center. Anyone is free to go through these, looking for fohat. Perhaps you will find it.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on November 8, 2011 at 2:13pm

David wrote : "*Wassiljew's 1860 German book that apparently quotes Schmidt's 1829 German book was published in French translation in 1863 as: Le Bouddhisme: ses dogmes, son histoire et sa littérature, by Vasilij Pavlovič Vasil'ev*"

I read through the 400+ pages of the french translation (search engines are not always reliable, depending the quality of the scanning), and nothing significant showed up, in regard with our quest. This book describe the history and the

philosophy of the Buddhism development throughout the various schools and countries where it propagated.

Few quotes from the sutra/tantra are listed.

The Lam Rim is quoted one time, as a generic reference, and one of the SD word, "**paranishpanna**" is described.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 8, 2011 at 2:41pm

Wow, Jacques, that is a lot of work. I really appreciate you reading through this whole book. For many years I have wondered if there might be something in it relevant to the search for the Book of Dzyan. Thank you very much for doing this and letting us know the results.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 8, 2011 at 3:03pm

Right now, we have come no nearer to finding fohat than the Russian "pohot" that Anna suggested. According to online sources, this Russian word means "lust," or "carnal desire." This is the same as what eros came to mean. But in Hesiod's Theogony, eros is a cosmic principle, and HPB equates it with fohat. As I mentioned a while back, Turanian was used by ethnologists and linguists in the 1800s for Mongolian and Uralic and Altaic and related people and languages of central Asia, and even Dravidian of southern India, following F. Max Muller.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 8, 2011 at 3:43pm

Jacques: is it spelled paranishpanna or parinishpanna?

Comment by [Olga Stolyarchik](#) on November 9, 2011 at 1:26am

Hi David,

Ural is a place where I've born and lived for 26 years. Ural - Sanskrit name for Near the Sun. And all the names for rivers, mountains and cities also originated from Sanskrit names. My home city - Perm' is located no the Ural mountain border of Europe and Asia and Permian Period named after city Perm. There is majestic nature all around there. Three major rivers (one is Kama) connected to 5 open seas. There are so much sacred traditions and many unknown to the world (even Russia's other regions) mystical in the land of the Great extinction, always.

A word pohot' (похоть) it does mean something similar to "lust" . But this word rarely used (I never heard) as noun. It used as adjective to a person (noun). Also Po-hot' originated from Po - over, cover and hot' - any. I cannot find any relevant connection with Fohat.

In my past lives 4 out of 6 I've born in Mongolia, Tibet and China. (Last 2 I've born Atlantis Uranus). I've been doing a research on personal characteristics of my present life vs past descends. Last time I went to Tibet in August 2010. I got many answers, most of the answers that I need to know. But when asked about Fohat, two monks with different explanations got me a little confused. A Teacher told me that there are a few different interpretations about Fohat. Certain things the monks teaches me required a special process. I am learning something everyday . What I don't know, if continue to following the Great Masters words, and I do so, everything will come. The answers, knowledge and a wisdom.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on November 9, 2011 at 4:17am

Good point Ingmar !

It is Parinichpanna (see below #3). According to Vassiliev :

#1 is Parakalpita

#2 is Paratantra

#3 is Parinichpanna

* ལྷོ་མཚོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ ch. biane tzzi tzzui cine.

* ལྷོ་མཚོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ ch. i ta tzzui cine.

* ལྷོ་མཚོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ ch. youane tchene tzzui cine.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 9, 2011 at 8:36am

Thank you, Olga, for clarifying the meaning and usage of the Russian word "pohot" for us. This is very helpful, especially as coming from a native of Ural. I have often seen that just relying on dictionaries, without seeing how a word is actually used in the language, leads to significant errors. Your knowledgeable statement that you cannot find any relevant connection of this word with fohat is convincing to me. I appreciate your input on this.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 9, 2011 at 12:06pm

David wrote:

"It has not been easy for me to find this word. But perhaps it will be easy for

someone else to find it. The Tibetan alphabet has only thirty letters, which can quickly be learned. Thousands of Tibetan books are now available online, through the Asian Classics Input Project, and the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center. Anyone is free to go through these, looking for fohat. Perhaps you will find it."

M. sufilight says:

First, I think we have to agree upon that Blavatsky called Fohat a Turanian compound word.

Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge:

"The word is a Turanian compound and its meanings are various. In China *Pho*, or *Fo*, is the word for "animal soul," the vital *Nephesh* or the breath of life. Some say that it is derived from the Sanskrit "Bhu," meaning existence, or rather the essence of existence."..... " Hence, as you will understand, life and electricity are one in our philosophy." (Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge, p. 86)

Now Blavatsky mentioned that Fohat was the "breath of life" in the SD. This in it self makes the word "Pho" or "Fo" identical with Fohat in either Chinese and perhaps also Tibetan.

Blavatsky said that the word had several meanings, and that it was written in several Buddhist books. The above seem to suggest a Chinese relation. If the word "Fohat" was Tibetan as such, I am sure Blavatsky would have said it, as she did with other words.

In Chinese:

Fo Guan = Buddha's light.

Guan-yin = Kwan Yin (pictured as a female in China) = Avalokitesvara (sanskrit).
Kwan-shai-yin is the male Logos according to HPB.

Fo Huo = Buddha's fire.

Foh or **Fo** = Buddha

So the word "Fohat" can perhaps therefore only be traced half-way to Tibetan. One will perhaps have to use several words in Tibetan to cover it. (And the use of Scholarly etymology is perhaps of no use here. Because we are on esoteric and occult turf). My take is that the word "**pho ba**" and related words (*pho ba'i* = Fire --- *pho nya* = Messenger --- 'bar 'ba = Catch fire, become ignited and more. -- 'phro 'bar = emission [JV] or phro ba = adiate[d] shine, emit,) to it is where to look in the Tibetan texts. But since you can read Tibetan a is saying that you cannot find it. I wonder what words the Tibetan Buddhist scriptures (Kalachakra Tantra and commentaries) translates the words covering Fohat as? What words are used in Tibetan for "LIFE", "the ONE LIFE", "electricity", "transfer of consciousness", "breath", "heat", "light", "flame", "life force", "fiery whirlwind" etc. etc. ??? - **Just list them shortly in Wilye translation.** And seek to find those words, which begin with "Pho" or which has synonyms with "Pho", - (some later translations might be somewhat incorrect.) - If there are nothing to find

there are nothing to find. (But I will be surprised.) - If so, then I will go for the Chinese language seeking it out. And I have already shown a few angles in the above.

My extra sensory perception, (not always reliable to put it mildly), keep telling me to tell the readers, that the Root Kalachakra Tantra or commentaries to it, which contain imagery language or images as such - are a good clue to HPB's teachings as such, perhaps also to the word "F

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 9, 2011 at 12:12pm

The last part of the previous post got cut short by the...automatic...forum-cutter...(smile.)

So the word "Fohat" can perhaps therefore only be traced half-way to Tibetan. One will perhaps have to use several words in Tibetan to cover it. (And the use of Scholarly etymology is perhaps of no use here. Because we are on esoteric and occult turf). My take is that the word "pho ba" and related words (*pho ba'i = Fire --- pho nya = Messenger --- 'bar 'ba = Catch fire, become ignited and more. -- 'phro 'bar = emission [JV] or phro ba = radiate[d] shine, emit,*) to it is where to look in the Tibetan texts. But since you can read Tibetan a is saying that you cannot find it. *I wonder what words the Tibetan Buddhist scriptures (Kalachakra Tantra and commentaries) translates the words covering Fohat as?*

What words are used in Tibetan for "LIFE", "the ONE LIFE", "electricity", "transfer of consciousness", "breath", "heat", "light", "flame", "life force", "fiery whirlwind" etc. etc. ??? - Just list them shortly in Wilye translation. And seek to find those words, which begin with "Pho" or which has synonyms with "Pho", - (some later translations might be somewhat incorrect.) - If there are nothing to find there are nothing to find. - Replacing Morphemes with other morphemes in sentences and even paragraph's might yield results. (But I will be surprised if no results occur at all.) - If so, then I will go for the Chinese language seeking it out. And I have already shown a few angles in the above and previously.

My extra sensory perception, (not always reliable to put it mildly), keep telling me to tell the readers, that the Root Kalachakra Tantra or commentaries to it, which contain imagery language or images as such - are a good clue to HPB's teachings as such, perhaps also to the word "Fohat". The first Dalai Lama wrote a commentary, but I am not sure that it is his, which are the proper one to use.

Fohat resides in the innermost chamber of the spiritual human heart. (The Voice of Silence, p. 10-11)

M. Sufilight

Comment by [Joe Fulton](#) on November 9, 2011 at 12:26pm

The problem here is that all of our references to Fohat are within Theosophical literature. We have exhausted those sources pretty thoroughly. The first known reference to Fohat is in Mahatma Letter #13 (2nd/3rd Ed.). Before that its existence is a mystery. What we are looking for lies most certainly outside of the Theosophical literature.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 9, 2011 at 3:00pm

HPB refers to Fohat as being called by the "Buddhist Arahat of Tibet" or by fourth degree Initiates. So this is likely to be within the Himalayan stronghold and HPB might have come across this when she was there.

DK, the Tibetan Master, mentions that it is "called by H. P. B. "Fohat." She was an arhat and this ties with its use and possible origin. It would then be only recently used, as by HPB in her works. Hence no other record that I am aware of.

DK also informs us that it is mentioned in the 'old commentary'.

"The "first tenuous thread spun by the Weaver in fohatic enterprise," as the Old Commentary puts it. Rays and the Initiations". 457.

"The words of the Old Commentary, found in the archives of the Masters." Esoteric Psychology II 32.

"Brahman, then, would be the germ thrown into the soil of that field, and Sakti, that mysterious energy or force which develops it, and which is called by the Buddhist Arahat of Tibet, Fohat. Five Years of Theosophy." 159.

"The seven centers in the body of the cosmic Lord of Fire, called by H. P. B. "Fohat." TCF 65.

JPC.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 9, 2011 at 3:49pm

On pariniṣpanna, for those who want to see this in the original Sanskrit, the texts are now available here on the Theosophical Network. Under Sanskrit Documents go to Buddhist Documents, and then scroll down to mahayana_sutralamkara_1907.pdf. This is the first Yogācāra text to be published in the original Sanskrit, and the first time that terms like pariniṣpanna could be verified. Go to page 22, where you will see the beginning of chapter 6, marked by roman numeral VI. You will see a line of text from the commentary introducing the first verse, then the two lines of verse 1. In the middle of the second line of the commentary following this verse, you will see the word pariniṣpanna.

This word may also be seen in another Yogācāra text posted here, [madhyanta_vibhaga_bhasyam_1967.pdf](#). In that text, go to page 3, where six lines from the top you will see pariniṣpanna as the third word in the first line of verse 6. This word is found again a few times on pp. 18-19, in the commentary on verse 3 of chapter 3.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 9, 2011 at 5:18pm

Fohat (Tib.). A term used to represent the active (male) potency of the Sakti (female reproductive power) in nature. The essence of cosmic electricity. An **occult Tibetan term** for Daiviprakriti primordial light: and in the universe of manifestation the ever-present electrical energy and ceaseless destructive and formative power. Esoterically, it is the same, Fohat being the universal propelling Vital Force, at once the propeller and the resultant.

This theosophical glossary on Fohat indicates it is an occult term and esoteric and not therefore exoteric prior to 1882. This supports it being a term used by the arhats and being made exoteric since the time of Blavatsky.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 9, 2011 at 9:57pm

You are probably right, Jeremy, that fohat is a sort of "in-house" term used by the initiates, and that is why we cannot find it in any known Eastern text. It is given as being in the Stanzas of Dzyan, and the quote you posted from Alice Bailey's book, *The Rays and the Initiations*, would indicate that it is also in the "Old Commentary." If it cannot be found in known sources, then we are left with trying to find the concept behind this technical term in various schools of thought, as Ingmar put it.

HPB equated fohat with śakti in her note on T. Subba Row's article in *Five Years of Theosophy*. The Sanskrit word śakti, in partial reply to M. Sufilight, is nus pa in Tibetan. T. Subba Row at the end of his article, "A Personal and an Impersonal God," associated cit-śakti with fohat. The term cit-śakti refers to the power or force or energy (śakti) of pure consciousness (cit). It is used, for example, in the *Yoga-vasiṣṭha*, book 4, chapter 42, on the descent of the jīvas into manifestation. This book, which T. Subba Row apparently used, is an important source that we should not neglect.

Let us assume, for the moment, that the parallel of cit-śakti to fohat is accurate. There is a clear parallel of cit-śakti to prabhāsvara, in its fuller form, citta-prakṛti-prabhāsvaratā, the natural luminosity of mind. The term cit as used in Vedānta for pure or ultimate consciousness is much like citta as used in the Buddhist texts for pure or ultimate mind when speaking of prabhāsvara. The Sanskrit word

prabhāsvara, in further reply to M. Sufilight, is 'od gsal in Tibetan, literally "clear light." As we have seen, we do have a brief cosmogonic account using prabhāsvara that is found in Buddhist tantric texts, the "Books of Kiu-te."

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 10, 2011 at 4:57am

Thanks David.

I wonder now whether "**phod pa**" - also written as "**p nu ba**" and similar words or dialect words are more or less directly synonyms to "**nus pa**" and the sanskrit **sakti**?

Are the words "phod pa" or "p nu ba" never mentioned in Buddhist scriptures relating to various Fohatic words as given by HPB?

Syn {thub pa} Syn {nus pa} Syn {shA kya}

<http://tthlib.org/org.thdl.tib.scanner.OnLineScannerFilter>

Why not throw just a few words - listed shortly - in Wylie from Tibetan Buddhist scriptures on how the Fohat words like "life force", "life it self", "fire", "heat", "light", "the light of Logos or Chenrezig", "breath", "energy", "energy movement", "fiery whirlwind", "transfer of consciousness" etc. etc. ???

And where in the texts they can these words be found and in relation to what kind of teaching?

I will be surprised if not one single one of the words are related to words like "**pho ba**" or "**phod pa**" or "**bo ba**" or similar. Then we will have to discard the idea of any kind of even partial etymology with regard to the word Fohat in the Tibetan scriptures. And then the Chinese scriptures must be more important in this regard.

Dead-letter reading was never reargarded highly by HPB and she said so in the Secret Doctrine.

M. Sufilight

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 10, 2011 at 2:10pm

The word śakti is not a cosmic force in Buddhism, so Tibetan words that translate Sanskrit words that come from the root śak, "to be able," are normally used to refer to mundane or everyday activities. The word phod pa is used in that sense.

English - Tibetan

light - 'od

life - srog

life force (prana) - srog
life itself - srog nyid
fire - me
flame - me
breath - dbugs
heat - drod
wind - rlung
energy (in the sense of vigor) - brtson 'grus

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 10, 2011 at 2:18pm

11 Fohat is divine thought or energy (Shakti) as manifested on any plane of the cosmos. It is the interplay between Spirit and matter. The seven differentiations of Fohat are: TCF 44.

"T. Subba Row at the end of his article, "A Personal and an Impersonal God," associated cit-śakti with fohat. The term cit-śakti refers to the power or force or energy (śakti) of pure consciousness (cit)". DR.

Thank you, David, in response to "Let us assume, for the moment, that the parallel of cit-śakti to fohat is accurate. There is a clear parallel of cit-śakti to prabhāsvara, in its fuller form, citta-prakṛti-prabhāsvaratā, the natural luminosity of mind"... and Fohat. This is of interest to us. We are here considering the "close connection between mind and fohat or energy". Subba Row associated pure consciousness with Fohat and as the latter is of the third aspect or closely allied with mahat we can here see a certain danger between the use of pure mahatic energy or mana in its disassociation from the love aspect.

Differentiated it manifests on the seven planes whilst it is still allied with thought power or divine thought or energy. This might be why Subba Row associated that term cit-śakti with fohat. The closest of the differentiated Shakti' are one of the six "Jnanashakti - The force of intellect or mind" found in Treatise on Cosmic Fire. S. Row might of been referring to this. The six are synthesised in the seventh being Shakti.

"The revelation of the close connection between mind and fohat or energy, or between thought power and electrical phenomena - the effect of fohatic impulse on matter - is fraught with peril, and the missing link (if so it might be termed) in the chain of reasoning from phenomena to its initiatory impulse, can only be safely imparted when the bridge between higher and lower mind, is adequately constructed". TCF 259.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 10, 2011 at 2:25pm

"The seven Saktis respectively called Para Sakti, Jnana-Sakti, etc., etc., are synonymous with the "Sons of Fohat," for they are their female aspects". BCW XII 620.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on November 11, 2011 at 12:13pm

Back to Wassiljew's book written in 1860 and published in French translation in 1863 as: *Le Bouddhisme: ses dogmes, son histoire et sa littérature*, there are some close similarities with what HPB wrote as commentaries in her SD.

On Vol.1 p.48, she wrote : "No Arhat, oh mendicants, can reach absolute knowledge before he becomes one with Paranirvana. *Parikalpita* and *Paratantra* are his two great enemies." (Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas).

(By the way this is another quote we may want to try to identify inside the buddhist canon.).

Then, she goes on, describing the sanskrit words she uses : "*Parikalpita* (in Tibetan *Kun-ttag*) is error, made by those unable to realize the emptiness and illusionary nature of all; who believe something to exist which does not - e.g., the Non-Ego. And *Paratantra* is that, whatever it is, which exists only through a dependent or causal connexion, and which has to disappear as soon as the cause from which it proceeds is removed -E.G, the light of a wick.

Looking now to Vassiliev (p.293), he described Parakalpita, and Paratantra with the following : "Parakalpita is the presupposition or the error; this is the understanding of animated beings who do not understand everything is void according to the true nature of what does not exist...as for example, the non-ego. Paratantra is something dependent, which does not survive in itself. Vassiliev is then using the sun beam as an illustration of Parikalpita as a mirage (instead of a wick light).

The fact that the 3 concepts of Parakalpita, Paratantra and Parinishpanna are described in Vassiliev's book, on the same page, together with the tibetan translation which is quoted by HPB (*Kun-ttag* for *Parakalpita*), and the similarities between the description may indicates she draw from him for her commentary.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on November 11, 2011 at 1:27pm

On page 61 of Volume 1 of the SD, HPB quote the following text :

The Ekasloka-Shastra of Nagarjuna (the Lung-shu of China) called by the Chinese the Yih-shu-lu-kia-lun.

Do we know what that text is ? Can it be the Lokatitastava (jig rten las 'das par bstod pa) ?

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 11, 2011 at 2:49pm

A translation of the **Ekaślokaśāstra** is found in chapter XIX of Edkins' "Chinese Buddhism". It is also spelled "Yih-shu-lu-kia-lun" there. As the title suggest, it consists of one śloka:

"My body (or substance) in its nature is not permanent;

Thus, then, my body is not a body.

My body in its nature not being a body,

I therefore say that it is empty and not permanent."

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 11, 2011 at 3:01pm

The [Lokātīstava](#) apparently has 28 verses.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 11, 2011 at 3:03pm

"No Arhat, oh mendicants, can reach absolute knowledge before he becomes one with Paranirvana. *Parikalpita* and *Paratantra* are his two great enemies." (Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas). SD1 48.

Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas. Probably an unavailable esoteric work. books.google.co.uk/books?isbn=0835602389... **Page 412. Secret Doctrine vol 3.**

Many thanks to Jacques. The above online book gives that info according to the search. So it seems to be an unavailable Buddhist esoteric text according to the online index. This is not in any other online edition other than google books search so google may have added this themselves.

This could mean that HPB did not draw directly from Wassiljew/Vassiliev 1860/3 but from the akashic record which was verified by KH. The quote is not direct as read but has 'similarities' though the tibetan text is noted. HPB references (Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas). It appears to be a quote from that source if it is a true original source. Where could Wassiljew have gotten similar information. Could he have had access to the esoteric text (Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas) somehow? KH verified certain quotations that were true and were then used by HPB as this is on record and DK said similar. My main point would be where did Wassiljew get that original info? Even if HPB drew from that 1860 text it is still of interest where Wassiljew got his source.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on November 11, 2011 at 3:17pm

Vassiliev, in his index, listed 3 texts which title includes the word bodhisattva :

Bodīcatvabouddanouc̣mritīcamadi	बो- धिसत्त्वबुद्धानुस्मृतिसमाधि
tra, 172.	cou- tra, 172.
Bodīcatvaboumi	बोधिसत्त्वभूमि
œuvre littéraire, 289, 290, 309.	œuvre littéraire, 289, 290, 309.
Bodīcatvaboumivritti	वृत्ति
littéraire, 310, 314.	œuvre littéraire, 310, 314.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 11, 2011 at 9:54pm

This quote from the Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas, like the quote from the Bodhimor, is another challenge for us to trace. While it could be from a secret book, it is surrounded by material from known books. Emil Schlagintweit in his 1863 book, Buddhism in Tibet, draws on Wassiljew's 1860 book, and HPB draws many things directly from Schlagintweit. His book, Buddhism in Tibet (available online) speaks of "Parikalpita (Tib. Kun tag), Paratantra (Tib. Zhan vang), and Parinishpanna (Tib. Yong grub)" on p. 34. He there goes on to say much the same as what Wassiljew said:

"Parikalpita is the supposition, or the error. Of this kind is the belief in absolute existence to which those beings adhere who are incapable of understanding that every thing is empty; of this kind is also whatever exists in idea only, without specific quality; or, in other words, whatever is attributed by our reflections and meditations to any object. There error can be two-fold; some believing a thing existing which does not, as e.g. the Non-ego; others assert the real existence of an object which only exists in the idea, as e.g. all outward things.

"Paratantra is whatever exists by a dependent or causal connexion; it form the basis of the error. . . ."

You can see the same words and phrases and ideas in the SD quote, and much more is drawn from Schlagintweit on these pages by HPB. For example, Schlagintweit p. 40: "This idea of the soul, Alaya, is the chief dogma of the Yogacharya system, which is so called because 'he who is strong in the Yoga (meditation) is able to introduce his soul by means of the Yoga into the true nature of existence.'" Compare SD 1.48 for the same sentence. Some of it he got wrong; e.g., that Alaya is Nyingpo and Tsang in Tibetan (Schlagintweit p. 39), and this error is copied by HPB (SD 1.48). In fact, alaya is kun gzhi in Tibetan. Other things Schlagintweit had right, and HPB misunderstood him and got them wrong; e.g., "Aryasanga, the Bumapa school" (SD 1.48; see Schlagintweit pp. 32, 40). Schlagintweit correctly said that the Bumapa (dbu ma pa) is the Madhyamika

school, not the Yogacharya school of Aryasanga. What is in the SD is like saying, "Martin Luther, the Catholic church," or "Pope Pius, the Lutheran church." K.H. was not verifying these quotes. He was no doubt far too busy with his other responsibilities. HPB could not even get him to answer her question about what word fohat is. She was left to handle the annotations to the Stanzas as best she could from available sources. Half of what she says on Tibetan Buddhism is wrong, because the then available sources are wrong.

The quote from "Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas" is not in Schlagintweit, and from Jacques' search, it is not in Wassiljew. It may be from a secret work. But it is found in the SD amidst many statements taken from then available sources, so we would expect it to also be findable in these sources.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 12, 2011 at 11:23am

David wrote:

"The word śakti is not a cosmic force in Buddhism, so Tibetan words that translate Sanskrit words that come from the root śak, "to be able," are normally used to refer to mundane or everyday activities. The word phod pa is used in that sense."

M. Sufilight says:

A few views.

I would still try with words looking like "pho" in Tibetan in various scriptures. - However, if the above words by you David indeed are true, I think that we easily can say, that there are not much etymology to be found in the Tibetan Buddhist scriptures with regard to the word "Fohat" - unless the scriptures are coded or the words should be replaced by synonyms or similar. It clearly leads to the view that if the word Fohat should be traced more clearly without seeking coded scripts, it should be traced in the Buddhist scriptures written in Chinese instead or perhaps another language. - The question must also be whether we can actually avoid coded scripts considering Blavatsky's words about the whole thing?

(See BCW. Vol. XIV, P. 424 - THE SECRET BOOKS OF "LAM-RIM" AND DZYAN) - We can always settle with the word 'Od as Fohat. And maybe it was in this manner HPB referred to it as existing in the Buddhist scriptures.

H. P. Blavatsky wrote about the Mystery Language in the Secret Doctrine Vol. I, p. 308:

"The peculiarity of this language was that it could be contained in another, concealed and not to be perceived, save through the help of special instruction; letters and syllabic signs possessing at the same time the powers or meaning of numbers, of geometrical shapes, pictures, or ideographs and symbols, the designed scope of which would be determinatively helped out by parables in the shape of narratives or parts of narratives; while also it could be set forth separately, independently, and variously, by pictures, in stone work, or in earth

construction."

H. P. Blavatsky wrote BCW Vol. III, p. 421:

"Be it as it may, there is reason to call the trans-Himalayan esoteric doctrine, Chaldeo-Tibetan."

.....

"In A Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese, by the Rev. Samuel Beal, there is a chapter "On the Tian-Ta'i School of Buddhism" (pp. 244-258) which our opponents ought to read. Translating the rules of that most celebrated and holy school and sect in China founded by Chinche-K'hae, called Che-chay (the wise one) in the year 575 of our era, when coming to the sentence which reads: "That which relates to the one garment [seamless] worn by the GREAT TEACHERS OF THE SNOWY MOUNTAINS (the school of the Haimavatas)" (p. 256) "....." the Aranyakas, or hermits."

(Zhiyi or Chi-i or Chi-Kai was "Che-chay".)

Aranyakas teach on the science of Prana-Vidya or Fire-Knowledge.

Was the Haimavata (Yun-Shan) School not a branch of the Sthavira Buddhists - and did Kashmir and Khotan play a role?

M. Sufilight

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on November 12, 2011 at 11:53am

The HPB Secret Doctrine Commentaries - The unpublished 1889 instructions, by Michael Gomez, has been published recently (2010). It brings more light on our research on Fohat.

The word "Fohat" is quoted 130 times in this book, and many discussions/questions are relative to it. So it is worthwhile to review it.

The discussions are also bringing some clues which could help understand why we have so many difficulties to find a single trace of this word in any other known tradition : even HPB do not seem to know very well from where it came. On page 363, one can read :

" Mr. Atkinson: Is Fohat in the Chinese represented by two Chinese syllables?

Mme. Blavatsky: It is from those parts something **I have been asking many times**. Fo means brilliant.

Mr. Atkinson: I know the root and the character of the Chinese syllable "Fo." If you could get the Chinese characters, I could turn it up in the Chinese dictionary.

Mme. Blavatsky: And in the Japanese, too. **I don't think it is a real word**, because **some of them call it Fohat**.

Mr. Atkinson: It would be "Ho" in Japanese. And it would represent the idea of "Ho," as "Ho" was a part of the phoenix. If it is the same as the Chinese, I mean. It becomes "Ho" in Japanese, and then becomes the "Ho" of the phoenix, as part of the compound name of the phoenix.

Mme. Blavatsky: Fohat is also a relation to the cycles, because the intensity of

this vital force changes with every cycle.

Mr. Atkinson: It is in the celestial cosmogony of China. It is in the celestial beginning and the cosmogenesis.

Mme. Blavatsky: **I wish you would look somewhere where you could find it, because I have been looking for it in India.**

Mr. Atkinson: If you will only give me the Chinese characters, I will find it at once.

Mme. Blavatsky: **I have got it somewhere, but not in the Chinese."**

The current summary document available on the Stanzas Documents has been updated to include the new input gathered from this publication. It is called "The Riddle of Fohat".

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 12, 2011 at 12:13pm

On the "Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas": in the Voice of the Silence we have a similar reference on p. 70 of the original edition, to "*Thegpa chenpoido*, 'Mahâyâna Sutra', Invocations to the Buddhas of Confession", Part 1., iv."

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 12, 2011 at 9:32pm

Many thanks, Jacques, for your greatly expanded compilation on fohat. The much new material from the recently published Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge seems to me to about double our knowledge of fohat from esoteric sources. Everyone discussing this topic should read it. Your good work, Jacques, is much appreciated.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 13, 2011 at 1:20pm

Many thanks to all. As researchers we must also take into account that AAB and the Tibetan DK gave further stanzas on Fohat or cosmic fire for Agni is Fohat. So the word is continued to be used in 1925 and though the origin of the stanzas from HPB and AAB are in research at this time it can be said that the word is from these documents of the arhats. HPB in SD indicates that the rig veda only offers a connection and perhaps not a direct citation. "Fohat is called the "Pervader" SD1 112.

Vishnu, *The Pervader* VII.99 Seer — Maitravaruni Vasishta 1. ... The God Vishnu is the Divine *Pervader*, the pervasive principle of Divine Consciousness. google book search. books.google.co.uk/books?isbn=0910261369... Wisdom of the ancient seers.

Thanks for the updated summary doc.

Thanks to Ingmar, also, for the further indications as to the "Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas".

Fohat is said in SD1 137 by a theosophical lecturer "It is called in several Buddhist books Fohat". This is yet to be verified.

Stanza II

..."AUM," said the Mighty One, He breathed forth to the fifth, the plane which is the burning-ground, the meeting place for fire. This time a cosmic note is heard beneath the sound systemic. The fire within, the fire without, meet with the fire ascending. The guardians of the cosmic fire, the devas of **fohatic** heat, watched o'er the forms that formless stood, waiting a point in time. TCF 13.

A Treatise on Cosmic Fire - Stanzas of Dzyan

The wheel of life turns within the wheel of outer form. Stanza XI

The matter of **Fohat** circulateth, and its fire hardeneth all the forms. The wheel that is not glimpsed moveth in rapid revolution within the slower outer case, till it weareth out the form. TCF 31.

In Their totality these seven Lords form the essence of the cosmic Lord, called in the occult books, **Fohat**. 23

In India, Fohat is connected with Vishnu and Surya in the early character of the (first) God; for Vishnu is not a high god in the Rig Veda. The name Vishnu is from the root vish, "to pervade," and Fohat is called the "Pervader" and the Manufacturer, because he shapes the atoms from crude material.* In the sacred texts of the Rig Veda, Vishnu, also, is "a manifestation of the Solar Energy," and he is described as striding through the Seven regions of the Universe in three steps, the Vedic God having little in common with the Vishnu of later times. Therefore the two are identical in this particular feature, and one is the copy of the other. SD1 112.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 13, 2011 at 1:27pm

The atoms emanated from the Central Point emanate in their turn new centres of energy, which, under the potential breath of **Fohat**, begin their work from within without, and multiply other minor centres. These, in the course of evolution and involution, form in their turn the roots or developing causes of new effects, from worlds and "man-bearing" globes, down to the genera, species, and classes of all the seven kingdoms* (of which we know only four). For "the blessed workers have received the **Thyan-kam**, in the eternity" (Book of "The Aphorisms of Tson-ka-pa").

"**Thyan-kam**" is the power or knowledge of guiding the impulses of cosmic energy in the right direction. SD1 635.

JC: I see no such words as Thyan-kam in a google book search, other than the SD.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 13, 2011 at 5:02pm

In Their totality these seven Lords form the essence of the cosmic Lord, called in the **occult books, Fohat**. TCF 31. 1925.

It is called in several **Buddhist books Fohat**. SD1 137. 1888.

It is notable that we must consider the reference to "buddhist books" and "occult books" in these statements from HPB and AAB. The Arcane School and Theosophical society must have a library of old books. Surly the word Fohat is mentioned within one such book. Perhaps not though.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 15, 2011 at 10:18am

Fohat has forsaken me. A great wind arose and knocked down power lines in my area. For two days and two nights this area was without the physical manifestation of fohat that we call electricity. Now that electricity has returned, I will resume from where I left off.

Regarding the Eka-śloka-śāstra by Nāgārjuna that HPB refers to in The Secret Doctrine (vol. 1, p. 61), as Ingmar said, an English translation of this is found in Rev. Joseph Edkins' 1880 book titled, Chinese Buddhism. This translation was prepared by Rev. Edkins in 1857, at a time when no one in the West had any accurate knowlege of Nāgārjuna or his teachings. Consequently, this translation is quite faulty. Everything that HPB says about this on p. 61 of the SD is taken directly from Edkins. Her statement about it meaning "the Substance giving substance to itself," "without action and with action," and "the nature which has no nature of its own," is quoted from Edkins' translation on p. 309, and repeated in his remarks on p. 317. The statement that the original word being explained is "subhāva," and about its etymology of "su" meaning "good," etc., is from p. 308 and footnote in Edkins' book. This is all wrong. The original word is "svabhāva," and there is no connection with "su."

A much more accurate translation of the Eka-śloka-śāstra was prepared by H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar with the help of Giuseppe Tucci, and published in 1927 in the The Half-Yearly Journal of the Mysore University. You will not find this on Google. It took me years to track it down, and then go to one of the two libraries in the U.S. that has it in order to photocopy it. This will be posted shortly here on Theosophy.net in a new section of English translations.

The Eka-śloka-śāstra is lost in the original Sanskrit, and is now found only in its early Chinese translation. It was not included in the Tibetan Buddhist canon, where a Tibetan translation of it would have been found in the Tengyur portion. However, a Tibetan translation of its one śloka or verse is found among the early texts discovered at Tun-huang, and this has been published in Louis de la Vallee Poussin's 1962 Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-huang in the India Office Library (p. 183). This will be included with the posting of Iyengar's 1927 translation here.

As is well known, the Tibetan translations are far more literally accurate than the Chinese translations. In case there was any question, this Tibetan translation from Tun-huang completely proves that there is no syllable "su" involved in the etymology of svabhāva from this text. It has "rang," the standard Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit syllable "sva," meaning "self" or "own," and by extension, "inherent." I will start a new post for Iyengar's translation of this verse, since this one will soon be cut off.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 15, 2011 at 10:40am

Iyengar's translation of the one śloka or verse that is the core of this text is given at the very beginning of his article, although it is not marked as such. The rest of his article is a translation of the remainder of this text, giving Nāgārjuna's explanation of his one verse. Iyengar chose to use Sanskrit technical terms in his translation, as these are much more accurate than the range of English equivalents used for them. Here is his translation of the verse:

"The nature of bhāva (Bhāva-svabhāva) is non-permanent (anitya). Accordingly, bhāva is abhāva. The nature of svabhāva is (also) abhāva. It is therefore taught that there are only śūnyatā and anityatā."

The word bhāva means existence, and the word abhāva means non-existence. As a technical term in Buddhism, bhāva refers to something that exists, and is therefore now often translated as an "existent," using "existent" as a noun rather than as an adjective. The bhāvas, "existents," or "existing things," are things that have origination, and consequently abide for a time, and then perish. Thus they are impermanent, anitya. This idea, anitya or impermanence, is one of the three ideas or characteristics that Buddhists use to distinguish their teachings, along with duḥkha or suffering, and anātman or absence of self. To these three, which characterize all of Buddhism, Mahāyāna Buddhism added a fourth, śūnyatā or emptiness. It is this fourth one that Nāgārjuna is famous for teaching and explaining. Here in this verse, he is coordinating śūnyatā or emptiness with the earlier taught anitya or impermanence. To do this, he must bring in the idea of svabhāva.

The teaching of śūnyatā or emptiness, stated more fully, is that all existing things, all bhāvas, are empty of svabhāva. Svabhāva means something's

"inherent nature." The example often used in Buddhist texts is that the svabhāva or inherent nature of fire is heat. This is the common everyday meaning of svabhāva. No one would say that fire is empty of heat, because heat always accompanies fire, and heat defines fire. Heat is the inherent nature or svabhāva of fire. But like all bhāvas or existing things, fire is something that arises, abides for a while, and then perishes. It does not exist on its own, but requires causes and conditions, such as fuel, spark, oxygen, etc. It therefore has no independent existence of its own. Any such impermanent thing that exists only in dependence on other things is ultimately non-existent. It is only conventionally existent, because its existence is temporary. This is how svabhāva has come to be used in Mahāyāna Buddhism, as something's "inherent existence," such that it would always exist. Nāgārjuna is here in this verse saying that no bhāva, no existing thing, has svabhāva, inherent existence.

The term svabhāva, that HPB is here explaining as it is found in the fifth śloka or verse of the second Stanza of Dzyan, will have to be understood as it is actually known today to be understood in Mahāyāna Buddhism, not as it was understood by early writers on Buddhism such as Rev. Joseph Edkins and Rev. Samuel Beal and Brian Hodgson, who did not know. HPB, following Brian Hodgson and Samuel Beal, also here says that "Svābhāvat" is "the 'Plastic Essence' that fills the Universe, and is the root of all things," and that it is "Buddhistic." This is not how Buddhists understand svabhāva in their texts. It is a mistake of these early Western writers, who got it wrong. Even the word "Svābhāvat" used by HPB is an incorrect form mistakenly copied from Max Muller, who had the form right as an ablative. If "svabhāva" is found in the Stanzas, we will have to see this in terms of how Buddhists have understood it for the past two thousand years in their texts.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on November 15, 2011 at 10:43am

Dear David, again very good information from you. That helps me much in my research - as one, who cannot Sanskrit. Interesting, what Tony Maddock once in theos-talk wrote:

A friend was having a look at the de Zirkoff edition, and the book fell open at page 61 (vol. I):

Original edition:

"Subhava, from which Svabhavat, is composed of two words: Su "fair," "handsome," good;" Sva, "self;" and bhava, "being" or "states of being."

Boris de Zirkoff's edition:

Subhava, from which Svabhavat, is composed of two words: Su "fair," "handsome," "good;" and bhava, "being" or "states of being."

It is not a spelling or quote change: "'Sva, "self;" is simply eliminated in the de Zirkoff edition.

Again here we have the problem to find giving HPB definitions of Sanskrit terms from Orientalist sources (as also in the case of Anupapadaka) which turn out as wrong spelled.

What does it mean?

Are these portions written by the woman Blavatsky, who did not understand Sanskrit and tried to do the best what she could after Subba Row refused to help?

Or are these blinds from HPB or a Master, hinting to old language forms now lost?

omment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on November 15, 2011 at 11:02am

Svabhava

Dear David, it seems you mean that svaháva and svabhavat are the same thing? Me thought they are different terms, are they? When svabháva means self-becoming I would think it means that the svabháva of an apple brings forth an apple (not a banana).

I d not see what is the difference of definition in the conventionally buddhistic schools. Please, could you give an example? Would Mahayana buddhists of today say that the apple has no svabháva?

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 15, 2011 at 1:08pm

A few views of mine...

With regard to the spelling of *Subhava*, *Svabhava* and *Svabhavat* and other spellings in the Secret Doctrine by Blavatsky. The Secret Doctrine was never meant to be read in a dead letter manner, and Blavatsky clearly wrote that in the Secret Doctrine. And also that it was written so to awaken the intuition of the Seeker after Wisdom, and therefore most likely not primarily its scholarly intellect. And some of the words might have been written orally, - see the quote in the below.

I do not believe that there were any international transliteration scheme on Tibetan, Sanskrit or Chinese established in 1888. (I think it is...Sanskrit in 1894, and Tibetan in 1959, and the Chinese was quite inadequate in 1888 until 1958 or so. And we can honestly question whether there is one with regard to occult and esoteric etymology even today.) And Further, it is my view, that there were so little knowledge about Eastern scriptures in 1888, even among the best scholars able to read English, that Blavatsky chose to actually quote other western

authors so to be helpful in making the readers understand, that what she wrote was not taken out of thin air. And perhaps also so that the book would be researched by those few intellectuals in her time, who could benefit from it. Yet, the time has gone, and the book is more than a 100 years old. In the latest decades we have however witnessed at great number of books being found and some of them being published in China. Few of them has been translated to Western languages. Further I would hesitate to say that all Chinese books are inaccurate. Maybe it is the readers who do not know to read occult Chinese?

H. P. Blavatsky wrote:

"Old truisms are often the wisest. The human mind can hardly remain entirely free from bias, and decisive opinions are often formed before a thorough examination of a subject from all its aspects has been made. This is said with reference to the prevailing double mistake (a) of limiting Theosophy to Buddhism: and (b) of confounding the tenets of the religious philosophy preached by Gautama, the Buddha, with the doctrines broadly outlined in "Esoteric Buddhism." Any thing more erroneous than this could be hardly imagined. It has enabled our enemies to find an effective weapon against theosophy; because, as an eminent Pali scholar very pointedly expressed it, there was in the volume named "neither esotericism nor Buddhism."

.....

"Agreeably with the rules of critical scholarship, the Orientalist has to reject a priori whatever evidence he cannot fully verify for himself. And how can a Western scholar accept on hearsay that which he knows nothing about? Indeed, that which is given in these volumes is selected from oral, as much as from written teachings."

.....

"A "scientific treatment" of a subject is no guarantee for its "historical basis"; and with such scarcity of data on hand, no philologist, even among the most eminent, is justified in giving out his own conclusions for historical facts."

.....

"I may repeat what I have stated all along, and which I now clothe in the words of Montaigne: Gentlemen, "I HAVE HERE MADE ONLY A NOSEGAY OF CULLED FLOWERS, AND HAVE BROUGHT NOTHING OF MY OWN BUT THE STRING THAT TIES THEM."

Pull the "string" to pieces and cut it up in shreds, if you will. As for the nosegay of FACTS—you will never be able to make away with these. You can only ignore them, and no more."

(Secret Doctrine Vol. I. p. xvii, xxvii, xxix and xlvi)

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 15, 2011 at 1:09pm

A few quotes more...

H. P. Blavatsky wrote:

"One of the greatest, and, withal, the most serious objection to the correctness and reliability of the whole work will be the preliminary STANZAS: "How can the statements contained in them be verified?" True, if a great portion of the Sanskrit, Chinese, and Mongolian works quoted in the present volumes are known to some Orientalists, the chief work—that one from which the Stanzas are given—is not in the possession of European Libraries. The Book of Dzyan (or "Dzan") is utterly unknown to our Philologists, or at any rate was never heard of by them under its present name. This is, of course, a great drawback to those who follow the methods of research prescribed by official Science; but to the students of Occultism, and to every genuine Occultist, this will be of little moment. The main body of the Doctrines given is found scattered throughout hundreds and thousands of Sanskrit MSS., some already translated—disfigured in their interpretations, as usual,—others still awaiting their turn. Every scholar, therefore, has an opportunity of verifying the statements herein made, and of checking most of the quotations. A few new facts (new to the profane Orientalist, only) and passages quoted from the Commentaries will be found difficult to trace. Several of the teachings, also, have hitherto been transmitted orally: yet even those are in every instance hinted at in the almost countless volumes of Brahminical, Chinese and Tibetan temple-literature."

(Secret Doctrine Vol. I. p. xxii-xxiii)

"My Books" by H. P. Blavatsky

http://www.katinkahesselink.net/blavatsky/articles/v13/y1891_024.htm

H. P. Blavatsky wrote about Secrecy:

"Students ask: Why such secrecy about the details of a doctrine the body of which has been publicly revealed, as in Esoteric Buddhism and The Secret Doctrine?"

To this Occultism would reply: For two reasons:

- (a) The whole truth is too sacred to be given out promiscuously.
- (b) The knowledge of all the details and missing links in the exoteric teachings, too dangerous in profane hands.

The truths revealed to man by the "Planetary Spirits" (the highest Kumâras, those who incarnate no longer in the universe during this Mahâmanvantara), who appear on earth as Avatâras only at the beginning of every new human race, and at the junction or close of the two ends of the small and great cycle, were made in time to fade away from the memory of man as he became more animalized. Yet, though these Teachers remain with man no longer than the time required to impress upon the plastic minds of child-humanity the eternal verities they teach, the spirit of the teachings remains vivid though latent in mankind. The full knowledge of the primitive revelation having, however, remained always with a few Elect, has been transmitted, from that time up to now, from one generation of Adepts to another. As the Teachers say in the Occult Primer: "This is done so as to ensure them (the eternal truths) from being utterly lost or forgotten in ages hereafter by the forthcoming generations. . ."

(BCW, Vol. XII, p. 600-601. - *Esoteric Instructions, no. III*)

M. Sufilight

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 15, 2011 at 2:19pm

[[Vol. 1, Page]] 61 DIVINE THOUGHT, DIVINE THINKERS.

Svabhavat, the "Plastic Essence" that fills the Universe, is the root of all things. Svabhavat is, so to say, the Buddhistic concrete aspect of the abstraction called in Hindu philosophy Mulaprakriti. It is the body of the Soul, and that which Ether would be to Akasa, the latter being the informing principle of the former. Chinese mystics have made of it the synonym of "being." In the Ekasloka-Shastra of Nagarjuna (the Lung-shu of China) called by the Chinese the Yih-shu-lu-kia-lun, it is said that the original word of Yeu is "Being" or "Subhava," "the Substance giving substance to itself," also explained by him as meaning "without action and with action," "the nature which has no nature of its own." Subhava, from which Svabhavat, is composed of two words: Su "fair," "handsome," "good"; Sva, "self"; and bhava, "being" or "states of being."

Consequently, this translation is quite faulty. Everything that HPB says about this on p. 61 of the SD is taken directly from Edkins. Her statement about it meaning "the Substance giving substance to itself," "without action and with action," and "the nature which has no nature of its own," is quoted from Edkins' translation on p. 309, and repeated in his remarks on p. 317. The statement that the original word being explained is "subhāva," and about its etymology of "su" meaning "good," etc., is from p. 308 and footnote in Edkins' book. This is all wrong. The original word is "svabhāva," and there is no connection with "su." DR.

JC: Excellent enquiries. Another way to view this is that HPB is simply indicating how the Chinese mystics interpret "svabhāva". This term "svabhāva" or Svabhava is used once SD1 571, and SVABHAVAT in the stanzas and the only [wrong] reference to "subhāva" is in that one instance used above.

Perhaps Edkins fell foul of his own words "the translators, instead of supplying us with correct versions, have interwoven them with their own commentaries, for the purpose of justifying the dogmas of their several schools."SD xxvii. The Nagarjuna translation was it appears to me, wrongly spelled or translated as Subhava. HPB did not use subhava other than in this chinese translation of Nagarjuna. I recall, David, that you mention the Tibetan terms more accurate. HPB used in the stanzas "SVABHAVAT" relating to or slightly seperating from the accurate tibetan "svabhāva." This is a technical gramatical point but not wrong.

On another take, "Subhava, from which Svabhavat, is composed of two words: Su "fair," "handsome," "good"; Sva, "self"; and bhava, "being" or "states of being." We could read, that Svabhavat is the original, and the Chinese mystics "have made of it" being, or Subhava as composed of 'su' and 'bhava'.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 15, 2011 at 4:58pm

"As for Svabhavat, the Orientalists explain the term as meaning the Universal plastic matter diffused through Space, with, perhaps, half an eye to the Ether of Science. But the Occultists identify it with "FATHER-MOTHER" on the mystic plane. (Vide supra.)" SD1 98.

Here, a distinction is made by HPB between the understandings of the 'Orientalists' and the 'Occultists' re the "informing principle" and root of all.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on November 15, 2011 at 5:27pm

>Here, a distinction is made by HPB between the understandings of the 'Orientalists' and the 'Occultists' re the "informing principle" and root of all.

Dear Jeremy, it seems that the Orientalists intemixed svabháva with svabhavat or the pastic essence, which is of course on its own plane or Father-Mother. Svabhavat therefore is not diffused through space and cannot be the Ether of scientists.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 15, 2011 at 8:02pm

Continuing in sequence, Ingmar had noted that:

On the "Aphorisms of the Bodhisattvas": in the Voice of the Silence we have a similar reference on p. 70 of the original edition, to "Thegpa chenpoido, 'Mahâyâna Sutra', Invocations to the Buddhas of Confession", Part 1., iv."

This reference is taken from Emil Schlagintweit's 1863 book, Buddhism in Tibet, p. 125. I have written about this in a letter published in the High Country Theosophist, vol. 12, no. 5, May 1997, pp. 13-14. This journal is no longer being published, and the back numbers are not easily accessible. Rather than repeat this here in a post that would be cut off, I have simply uploaded a PDF of this letter to the Voice discussion being led by Jon Fergus. It not only gives the source of this reference, but it also points out a strange error in the text of the Voice of the Silence, copied from Schlagintweit.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 15, 2011 at 9:43pm

The much new material from the SD Commentaries that Jacques has compiled for us gives a good picture of fohat. This material also gives me the clear impression that HPB knew exactly what fohat is, and only had difficulty in expressing it to her audience. Fohat and its place in the SD cosmogony seems very clear in her mind.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 16, 2011 at 3:48am

David wrote:

"This reference is taken from Emil Schlagintweit's 1863 book, Buddhism in Tibet, p. 125. I have written about this in a letter published in the High Country Theosophist, vol. 12, no. 5, May 1997, pp. 13-14. This journal is no longer being published, and the back numbers are not easily accessible. Rather than repeat this here in a post that would be cut off, I have simply uploaded a PDF of this

letter to the Voice discussion being led by Jon Fergus. It not only gives the source of this reference, but it also points out a strange error in the text of the Voice of the Silence, copied from Schlagintweit."

I think it is the below assumed error or blunder which are referred to...

High Country Theosophist, vol. 12, no. 5, May 1997, pp. 13-14:
"But there is a much more serious blunder."

.....

"In fact, the Tibetan *gsol-ba-'debs*, which here translates the Sanskrit word, *yacayami*, does mean "entreat" or "beg," but not "believe."

Thus in this text it is not "I believe that not all the Buddhas enter nirvana," but rather is "I entreat all the Buddhas not to enter nirvana;" i.e., I request them to stay and work for the welfare of living beings.

Such "entreating," of the Buddhas is an everyday practice among Tibetan Buddhists, which even the most unlearned knows well (see, for example, *Bodhicaryavatara* 3.5).

This blunder may perhaps have entered the Voice through Blavatsky's haste in writing it."

<http://www.hctheosophist.com/archives/pdf/hc199705.pdf>

M. Sufilight says: I do not think it was a blunder. The esoteric reading might give Blavatsky the upper hand here. Esoteric texts are often known to have several layers of reading. I see no need for reading this text literally if it also is a part of the *Dzyan Stanzas*, and if the reference merely was used so to highlight the real text which Emil Schlagintweit's was writing about. I find in fact Blavatsky use of words to be more correct, because it is not all Seekers who enter the Nirvana-Dharma, some follow the *Bodhisattva* path. See also foot note 33 and 34.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 16, 2011 at 2:42pm

"I entreat all the Buddhas not to enter nirvana;" i.e., I request them to stay and work for the welfare of living beings. DR.

To "entreat all the Buddhas not to enter nirvana" makes perfect sense in the context of Earth service, the *Bodhisattva* path. Also in context of a "Pratyeka Buddha" found in the same book. A small analogy might be where the Tibetan DK tells of an instance where the Christ Maitreya requests or suggests his Chohans to remain in earth service during a time to aid the work of the Christ.

"Today, however, in taking this sixth initiation, all of the Masters so doing and under the suggestion of the Christ, continue to make the decision which will control Their future progress on one of the seven Paths of the Higher Evolution, but - at the same time - all of Them are postponing this proposed progress upon Their chosen Path in order, for a brief time, to implement and aid the work of the Christ and help towards the externalization of the Hierarchy, through the medium of certain of its Ashrams; They will also form a protecting wall around the Christ, and act as liaison officers between Their great Leader and the Avatar of Synthesis." RI 655.

'yacayami' is here mentioned...

[Sacred biography in the Buddhist traditions of South and Southeast ...](#)

books.google.co.uk/books?isbn=8120818121... [Juliane Schober](#) - 2002 - Religion - 366 pages

Takasaki, A Study of the Ratnagotravibhaga (Uttaratantra), p. 178 and p. 17J n. 45. 50. nirvatukamamsca jinan yacayami krtanjali // kalpananant5mstif(hantu ...

(38). "Pratyeka Buddhas are those Bodhisattvas who strive after and often reach the Dharmakaya robe after a series of lives. Caring nothing for the woes of mankind or to help it, but only for their own bliss, they enter Nirvana and — disappear from the sight and the hearts of men. In Northern Buddhism a "Pratyeka Buddha" is a synonym of spiritual Selfishness." Voice.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 16, 2011 at 3:51pm

H. P. Blavatsky on Pratyeka Buddhists and their Selfish activities...
WORLD-IMPROVEMENT OR WORLD DELIVERANCE
http://www.katinkahesselink.net/blavatsky/articles/v11/y1889_044.htm

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 17, 2011 at 1:20am

Thank you David for reminding me/us about your clear letter in the High Country Theosophist. I must have read it, but forgot. Again we see here that HPB refers to Western books of her time, instead of original sources she may - or in this case may not - have had access to. Title of the "Thegpa chenpoido" from Schlagintweit's Buddhism in Tibet, p.123: sdig pa thams chad bshags par gter chos

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on November 17, 2011 at 3:40am

Thanks you Ingmar for this reference.

Another track HPB gave us for tibetan texts she could have had access to can be found [here](#)

It refers to a Kanjur text - *Tched-du brjod-pai tsoms*.

This article can be found also in Lucifer Vol. XV or in BCW Vol. VI p.94.

Interesting enough is that HPB, in this article, quoted openly some of the then-current "tibetologist" works available to her like Klaproth, Samuel Beal, Emil Schlagintweit, Georges Bogle. Which may confirm one of our hypothesis which is that HPB draws naturally (not as a plagiary) from existing works to try to explain complex and abstruse teachings.

She also quote another phrase from the "Book of Khui-ti" : 'He gazes with indifference in every sphere of upward transmigration on the whole period of time which covers the shorter periods of personal existence.'

In this article, she is using other 'tibetan or else' vocabulary which may be added to our word quest, like **Nipang**, **Tharlam** (the path to deliverance).

Finally, based on our recent discussions here, we may want to collect in one place (if it does not exist yet ! - maybe David has already done that) all the references to tibetan texts which can be found in HPB works, to provide with a type of documents database for reference.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 17, 2011 at 9:59am

Very interesting, Frank, about the omitted phrase, "Sva, 'self'," in Boris de Zirkoff's edition of The Secret Doctrine. Boris does not here add a note referring

to Joseph Edkins' book, Chinese Buddhism, but it is possible that he consulted it for making the change. Edkins also says nothing about "sva" or "self" here (p. 308 fn.), but only has "su" and "bhāva" and their meanings. The one time I met Boris, I asked him about a similar change in the SD. The SD, vol. 1, p. 661, had "the sixth degree of Libra" in a quotation from J. S. Bailly, while Boris had changed this to "the sixth degree of Aquarius." Boris added a note here, saying that the original French text being quoted has "Verseau" meaning "Aquarius," rather than "Libra," so he restored what was in the original.

In person, he replied to my question saying that since Aquarius was in the original, what else could he do but restore it. Of course, this is true. Quotations must be accurate. Ever since its publication in 1978, I have always used Boris de Zirkoff's edition of the SD, because he spent many, many years checking and verifying quotations such as this one. But now, the online edition is the original 1888 edition, and seems to be the only one available online. So the benefit of the corrections made by Boris is not available to online users. Here in this section where the Libra/Aquarius problem is found, for example, Boris has added quotation marks showing that whole pages of text are direct quotations from Bailly. In the 1888 edition this material, lacking the quotation marks, appears to be written by HPB.

For every place where Boris has made a change that perhaps should have been noted, such as the omitted phrase, "Sva, 'self'," on p. 61, or may even be incorrect, there are probably fifty or a hundred places where his changes bring in much needed corrections to incorrect quotations, wrong references, etc. He has taken The Secret Doctrine as published in 1888 as far as can be taken in making it reliable and accurate. The next step will be to deal with the content itself that is taken from the erroneous sources then available. The Stanzas of Dzyan will have to be annotated anew, from the much more accurate and extensive sources now available. The research taking place here in this discussion will contribute to this.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 17, 2011 at 11:59am

I just saw the following article...

ON THE OLDEST CHINESE TRANSLITERATIONS OF THE NAME OF BUDDHA

"They were agreed only on one point that Fou-t'u came to be used earlier than Fo."

.....

"In Chinese there are more than 20 different transliterations of this name: Fo-t'o, Fou-t'o, Fou-t'ou, Pu-t'o, Pu-ta, Pu-to, Pu-t'o, Mu-t'o, Meita, Fo-ta, Pu-t'a, Fou-t'u, Fu-tou, Mu-ta, Fo-t'u, Fo, Pu-t'o, Wu-t'a, Pu-t'o, Mei-t'o etc."

http://hk.plm.org.cn/e_book/jxl/19_36.htm

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 17, 2011 at 12:32pm

The "Tched-du brjod-pai tsoms" from [CW VI, 95](#) would be the ched du brjod pa'i tshoms, which is the Udānavarga, Tohoku no. 326 in the Kanjur. The passage quoted is to be found in Udānavarga 4.4, and a corresponding passage is found in Dhammapada 2.8.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 17, 2011 at 1:52pm

In the CW, see [CW VI, 95](#) bottom page, Boris de Zirkoff has made a summary of the terms from "Tibetan Teachings". He found nipang, thar lam and most Tibetan and other terms, and also the Tched du.. as Udānavarga.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 17, 2011 at 3:22pm

On the question raised about the difference between svabhāva and svabhavat, this had come up earlier here, and was discussed on October 21 and 22, 2010, and some following posts. I would refer newer participants here back to those posts. In brief, svabhavat as a present participle meaning "self-becoming," proposed by G. de Purucker, was as good of a guess as could be made then, before the Sanskrit Buddhist texts were available. But such a form has never been found, and in any case would not be able to function as a noun, which is how HPB used it. Her svābhāvat, thanks to the reference discovered by Daniel Caldwell, is now seen to have been copied from Max Muller's use of the word svabhāva as declined in the ablative case, svabhāvāt.

Mahāyāna Buddhists do accept the conventional existence of svabhāva. Thus, an apple seed will produce an apple tree, and not a banana tree. This is the common everyday "inherent nature" or svabhāva of an apple seed. But as a technical term, svabhāva has normally been defined in Indian texts, not only Buddhist but also Hindu and Jaina, as something that cannot change. The common example of it or the sometimes used synonym prakriti, given by Patanjali in his great commentary on Panini's grammar and by many others, is of gold or clay. No matter what form these take, the gold or clay remains unchanged. Whether it is an earring or a coin, it is still gold. Gold is immutable or unchangeable in the sense of being gold, but quite mutable or changeable in the sense of being earrings, coins, etc. A classic definition formulating this, using the synonym prakriti, is given for Hindus by Gaudapada twice in his Mandukya-karika (3.21cd and 4.29cd), and virtually the same line is given for Buddhists by Nagarjuna in his Mula-madhyamaka-karika (15.8cd). It says that change on the part of prakriti can in no way happen. This defines it.

This means that something having svabhāva, which therefore could not change, must have always existed. It could not be something that is made or fabricated or constructed, and it could not be something that is dependent on anything else, on causes and conditions, for its existence. Nagarjuna uses these two defining ideas in his Mula-madhyamaka-karika 15.2cd, which William Ames translates as: "For svabhava is non-contingent and without dependence on another." Nothing in the known universe, say Mahayana Buddhists, meets these criteria. Therefore, nothing in the known universe has svabhāva, in the sense of the philosophical technical term. Heat is conventionally the svabhāva of fire. But ultimately fire has no svabhāva, because it is impermanent or changing, being dependent on conditions.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 17, 2011 at 4:48pm

Jeremy called our attention to a helpful distinction:

"As for Svabhavat, the Orientalists explain the term as meaning the Universal plastic matter diffused through Space, with, perhaps, half an eye to the Ether of Science. But the Occultists identify it with "FATHER-MOTHER" on the mystic plane. (Vide supra.)' SD1 98."

"Here, a distinction is made by HPB between the understandings of the 'Orientalists' and the 'Occultists' re the "informing principle" and root of all."

The "Orientalists" mean Brian Houghton Hodgson from the early 1800s and everyone who followed him until a better knowledge of the meaning of svabhava was obtained (although he only used the term svabhava, not svabhavat). We cannot ignore or sweep under the rug the several statements made by HPB that also take svabhava(t) as the universal plastic matter diffused through space, as here on the very same page of the SD. Yet if we identify svabhava with the "Father-Mother" of the Stanzas, as she says here, it will help us in our search. Has anyone found the term "father-mother" in any Eastern text? This is worth pursuing.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 17, 2011 at 9:06pm

"Finally, based on our recent discussions here, we may want to collect in one place (if it does not exist yet ! - maybe David has already done that) all the references to tibetan texts which can be found in HPB works, to provide with a type of documents database for reference."

This, I think, is a very good suggestion, Jacques. I have not already done this.

"ON THE OLDEST CHINESE TRANSLITERATIONS OF THE NAME OF BUDDHA."
This article was helpful to me, M. Sufilight. Thanks for the link. It shows the possibility of Kuchean or Tocharian words being transliterated as the basis for Chinese words such as "fo" or "Fou-t'u." I was unaware of this before.

"The "Tched-du brjod-pai tsoms" from CW VI, 95 would be the ched du brjod pa'i tshoms, which is the Udānavarga, Tohoku no. 326 in the Kanjur. The passage quoted is to be found in Udānavarga 4.4, and a corresponding passage is found in Dhammapada 2.8."

Great identification, Ingmar. Good that you traced the particular verse number that was quoted.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 18, 2011 at 2:21am

A very interesting article [On the Oldest...](#) M. Sufilight! Earlier this week I had been looking at Chinese sources of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā and Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras, (so far) they are using the syllable fó (佛) in the words Buddha, Buddhist etc.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 18, 2011 at 11:50am

Concerning the syllable "fo": an example of the Vajracchedikā (Diamond Sūtra), one the oldest Buddhist scriptures translated into Chinese. Both these two renderings (below) are the same translation by Kumārajīva, 2nd c. AD, which is the earliest known Chinese version.

1. [Diamond Sutra in CBETA](#), Taishō no. 235

The first two lines reproduced here, with fó (Buddha) in bold:

□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□□□

[0748c20] □□□□□

[0748c20] □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

Translation of the first lines by Edward Conze (1958):

"Thus have I heard at one time. The Lord dwelt at Śrāvastī, in the Jeta Grove, in the Garden of Anāthapindada, together with a large gathering of monks, consisting of 1,250 monks, and with many Bodhisattvas, great beings."

2. [Dunhuang manuscript of the Diamond Sutra](#), dated before 401 AD

The same character fó is [highlighted in green here](#). Note that the text is written from right to left.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 21, 2011 at 1:59pm

About agni deriving from 'agnz' and 'vuni' I am seeing the obvious ag and ni but also regards Fohat, in this consideration. If Fohat is not Sanskrit what language could it be derived from other than the language of the arhats. It appears to be taken from the masters archives pre dating Sanskrit being ideographic and symbolic. We have from the Stanzas of Dyzan the following clue that the word Fohat could be entirely unknown to the 'orientalists'. We are now aware of some of its associations.

S.D. Volume 1 Stanza VI.1

" By the power of the Mother of Mercy and Knowledge – Kwan-Yin – the "triple" of Kwan-Shai-Yin, residing in Kwan-yin-Tien, Fohat, the Breath of their Progeny, the Son of the Sons, having called forth, from the lower abyss, the illusive form of Sien-Tchang, and the Seven Elements : (*)

(*) Verse 1 of Stanza VI is of a far later date than the other stanzas, through still very ancient. The old text of this verse, having names entirely unknown to the Orientalists would give no clue to the student. SD1 32.

"i.e. Fohat; vuhni being the Sanskrit for fire, as well as agnz." Lucifer vol 4 pg 410.

"Agni is Fohat, the threefold Energy (emanating from the logocic Ego) which produces the solar system, the physical vehicle of the Logos, and animates the atoms of substance." TCF 610.

www.scribd.com/doc/.../Lucifer-Vol-04-March-1889-August-1889

The word vehement seems to suggest the secret Vahan or vehicle of the Alhim, i.e. Fohat; vuhni being the Sanskrit for fire, as well as agnz: Modym is the ...

[Lucifer, Vol.04 - March 1889 - August 1889](#)

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 22, 2011 at 10:17pm

Unless Ingmar finds something in the Chinese, the most likely conclusion is that fohat is indeed a word from a secret language that is entirely unknown to orientalists. The connection of fohat in meaning to agni seems to be well established. I. K. Taimni also says this in his 1969 book, Man, God and the Universe, in the chapter titled "Fohat (Agni), Prana and Kundalini." On p. 378, he writes:

The name Fohat is taken from The Secret Doctrine because the nature of this creative force or agency is described in some detail under this name in her work,

by H. P. Blavatsky. The word which comes nearest to Fohat in Sanskrit literature is Agni but this word has so many other connotations that it is better to use the word Fohat for the creative force of Brahma."

But this brings us no closer to tracing the word fohat itself. The Sanskrit word agni means fire, as does the Sanskrit word spelled vahni. There is no agnz in Sanskrit; it looks like just a mistake in the OCR process. The spelling vuhni represents the pronunciation of vahni. Is there any Chinese word for fire that is like fohat?

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 23, 2011 at 4:43am

A feww views...

What about the many Chinese dialects, some of them related to the Naxi languages, where some in fact are considered older than suspected? ("Chinese Buddhism: a volume of sketches, historical, descriptive, and critical" by Joseph Edkins - p. 139 --- Here Joseph calls Kwan-Yin by the name Pu-to and Pu-ta, just like the scientists in my previous post. And Kwan Yin is also triple Kwan-Yin and the Light of Logos and therefore "Fohat". se SD, vol. 1, p. 136. Maybe this is the word Fohat merely transcribed differently, because it was wirtten or pronounced differently in the pre-Vedic times, when using the Senzar language?)

In the search after Dzyan Stanzas and the Senzar language...I came to consider the following...

H. P. Blavatsky wrote:

"The work from which I here translate forms part of the same series as that from which the "Stanzas" of the Book of Dzyan were taken, on which the Secret Doctrine is based. Together with the great mystic work called Paramârtha, which, the legend of Nâgârjuna tells us, was delivered to the great Arhat by the Nagas or "Serpents" (in truth a name given to the ancient Initiates), the "Book of the Golden Precepts" claims the same origin. Yet its maxims and ideas, however noble and original, are often found under different forms in Sanskrit works, such as the Dnyaneshwari, that superb mystic treatise in which Krishna describes to Arjuna in glowing colours the condition of a fully illumined Yogi; and again in certain Upanishads. This is but natural, since most, if not all, of the greatest Arhats, the first followers of Gautama Buddha

were Hindus and Aryans, not Mongolians, especially those who emigrated into Tibet. The works left by Aryasanga alone are very numerous.

The original Precepts are engraved on thin oblong squares; copies very often on discs. These discs, or plates, are generally preserved on the altars of the temples attached to centres where the so-called "contemplative" or Mahâyâna (Yogachârya) schools are established. They are written variously, sometimes in Tibetan but mostly in ideographs. The sacerdotal language (Senzar), besides an alphabet of its own, may be rendered in several modes of writing in cypher characters, which partake more of the nature of ideographs than of syllables. Another method (lug, in Tibetan) is to use the numerals and colours, each of which corresponds to a letter of the Tibetan alphabet (thirty simple and seventy-four compound letters) thus forming a complete cryptographic alphabet. When the ideographs are used there is a definite mode of reading the text; as in this case the symbols and signs used in astrology, namely the twelve zodiacal

animals and the seven primary colours, each a triplet in shade, i.e. the light, the primary, and the dark—stand for the thirty-three letters of the simple alphabet, for words and sentences. For in this method, the twelve "animals" five times repeated and coupled with the five elements and the seven colours, furnish a whole alphabet composed of sixty sacred letters and twelve signs. A sign placed at the beginning of the text determines whether the reader has to spell it according to the Indian mode, when every word is simply a Sanskrit adaptation, or according to the Chinese principle of reading the ideographs. The easiest way however, is that which allows the reader to use no special, or any language he likes, as the signs and symbols were, like the Arabian numerals or figures, common and international property among initiated mystics and their followers. The same peculiarity is characteristic of one of the Chinese modes of writing, which can be read with equal facility by any one acquainted with the character: for instance, a Japanese can read it in his own language as readily as a Chinaman in his."

(The Voice of Silence, p. vi-ix, the Edmonton edition)

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 23, 2011 at 5:35am

On fohat: earlier I have made a diagram of the etymological relations between all of the leads HPB provides on fohat. After checking it and updating it with Jacques' list "2011-11-12 The Riddle of Fohat.doc" I will publish it here.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 23, 2011 at 5:43am

A very interesting upload of the Ekaślokaśāstra in the area for English texts this weekend! The Tibetan version from Dunhuang seems indeed "pre-standard Tibetan". I have been looking for images on the site of the International Dunhuang Project, but could not find any.

Maybe it would also be useful to have some more books of orientalists of HPB's time, like Schlagintweit, Wassilew, Edkins and Müller ("Chips" Vol. I) in the "Stanzas Documents" area? Many of these are available in PDF, copyrights expired.

Comment by [Joe Fulton](#) on November 23, 2011 at 5:44am

I think we can do that. You can send a list of authors/documents in an e-mail to me or post it here and we can start digging for them and hopefully have a fairly decent selection up by Sunday night in the Stanzas of Dzyan section.

Comment by [Capt. Anand Kumar](#) on November 23, 2011 at 5:48am

Thank You Ingmar for taking up the making of a diagram on Fohat. You could also perhaps consider dividing the diagram into two: One where Fohat is considered as an entity and the other where it is portrayed as a process.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 23, 2011 at 1:53pm

Yes, Ingmar, the Dunhuang Tibetan of the Ekaślokaśāstra does seem to be "pre-standard Tibetan," before translation terms and also spellings were standardized. As you saw, the spellings "myi" and "myed" are what later became "mi" and

"med." The pre-standardized translation terms make it harder to determine the Sanskrit behind this early Tibetan translation. Nonetheless, they give us a great advantage over the far less standardized Chinese translation. Here is what I get from it:

Tibetan:

rang gi ngo bo nyid myi rtag
de bzhin ngo bo ngo bo myed
rang bzhin ngo bo nyid myed pas
de phyir stong dang myi rtag gsungs

Tibetan with Sanskrit equivalents:

rang gi (sva) ngo bo nyid (svabhāva) myi rtag (anitya)
de bzhin (tathā) ngo bo (svabhāva) ngo bo myed (niḥsvabhāva)
rang bzhin (svabhāva) ngo bo nyid myed pas (niḥsvabhāva)
de phyir (tasmāt) stong (śūnya) dang (ca) myi rtag (anitya) gsungs (ukta)

English with Sanskrit equivalents:

"The inherent nature (svabhāva) of self (sva, ātman) is impermanent (anitya);
so (tathā) inherent nature (svabhāva) is absence of inherent nature
(niḥsvabhāva).

Because inherent nature (svabhāva) is absence of inherent nature
(niḥsvabhāva),

therefore (tasmāt) [all] is said (ukta) to be empty (śūnya) and impermanent
(anitya).

In the first line, sva, "self" or "own" or "inherent," would imply ātman, "self," and would be used instead of ātman to make the correlation with the sva of svabhāva, "self-nature" or "inherent nature." Buddhists already accepted that ātman is impermanent. But they also accepted that the individual dharmas do have their own svabhāva. Now Nāgārjuna is relating the accepted teaching of impermanence to svabhāva, so that he can make his new point about absence of svabhāva (niḥsvabhāva). This is the new teaching of emptiness (śūnyatā), that all dharmas are empty of svabhāva.

In the second line, I take Tibetan ngo bo and ngo bo myed as abbreviated forms, necessary for the meter, that translate svabhāva and niḥsvabhāva. They could possibly translate Sanskrit bhāva and abhāva. It would then say: "so (tathā) existents (bhāva) are non-existent (abhāva)."

In the third line, we see together both of the two later standard translations of svabhāva: rang bzhin and ngo bo nyid.

In the fourth line, I have added the implied subject, "all." This would not be necessary if we took the adjectives stong, "empty," and myi rtag, "impermanent," as abbreviated forms, necessary for the meter, of the nouns stong pa nyid, śūnyatā, "emptiness," and myi rtag nyid, anityatā, "impermanence." It would then say: "therefore emptiness and impermanence are taught."

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 23, 2011 at 2:03pm

As you say, M. Sufilight, there are many Chinese dialects. So fohat could perhaps be found in one of them. But the problem would remain that we need to find this word used in texts in the same meaning that Theosophy gives it. It would have to be a central idea in a cosmogony or worldview. It could not just be an obscure word that plays no such role.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 23, 2011 at 3:57pm

Yes, David. Fohat is a Turanian compound said Blavatsky. So a completely literal version is perhaps not found in Chinese dialects either. But Turanian languages (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turanian> - and - <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turanian>) are today said to be either Altaic languages or Uralic languages. I will go for the Altaic languages (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Altaic_languages) and Buddhist texts - and perhaps those related to Chinese. Is it true that the Dalai Lama has said that if he should point at where he think Shamballa is, it would be in the area near the Altai mountains? (I read it on the Internet somewhere.)

HPB called the Avesta language especially the Gathas for Zen-d-sar (Senzar) language (BCW. vol. IV, p. 517-518 footnotes). And since we know that the Dzyan Stanzas was written using Senzar language, this must be an important language in this regard. And Dzyan Stanzas are older than the Vedic language said Blavatsky.

(anghuyat [anghuya] --- 12 (Abl) life force (Mal), energy (Hum), vital power (t141); heart, conscience (k18))

<http://www.avesta.org/avdict/avdict.htm> or
<http://www.avesta.org/kanga/english.htm>

I sometimes wonder. It is said that there exist several Kalachakra Tantra scripts in the Kham region. They are apparently not easily accessible to the public?

Fohat is the "light" or "life force" of all the three Logoi according to "Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge".

I just referenced Edkins on him saying that Pu-to and Pu-ta is given as Logos (Guan-Yin) in some books, and earlier the learned scholars said that this also was the word for Buddha. So maybe one need to have a closer look at those Chinese texts - especially since Blavatsky as we learned earlier also mentioned that the word "fohat" was to be found in Chinese. If you pronounce the sound of "pu-ta" in Chinese it almost sound like "fohat" in Chinese transliteration, maybe except the occult "t" added by Blavatsky, (well that is how I see it). If "pu-ta" cannot be found in any chinese texts, then we will have to wonder why Edkins mentioned it in his book. Do you not think so? - Further there might be other dialects with regard to how the word "pu-ta" is given - and - Guan-yin or the triple Kwan-Shai-Yin is given in various Buddhist texts.

(See also Secret Doctrine, vol. I, p. 308 - "this language" ..."could be contained in another". Reading Senzar - see "The Voice of Silence" p. vi-ix - Edmontion Edition. See "THE TWELVE SIGNS OF THE ZODIAC" by T. Subba Row on reading Sanskrit in an occult manner.)

Sino-Tibetan Languages (There are also many dialects:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sino-Tibetan_languages. Some dialects are related to Chinese.) Tibeto-Burman languages (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bodic_languages - an excellent overview of the geography of the central dialects.) There are over 100 languages or dialects of Naxi in the Yunnan province alone it is said.

I have found similarities between the Brahmi script, Avestan, Harappa pictograms, Vinca script (Romania and Greece), Sumerian pictograms, Chinese pictograms, and other scripts - in the period 2.000 BC - 6.000 BC (according to ordinary science dates). HPB used a Chinese text of the Dzyan Stanzas as well (SD. Vol. I, p. 136)

I hope this helped.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 25, 2011 at 8:05am

- a. rang gi ngo bo nyid myi rtag
- b. de bzhin ngo bo ngo bo med
- c. rang bzhin ngo bo nyid myed pas
- d. de phyir stong dang myi rtag gsungs

Human nature is finite,

So human nature is [in fact] unnatural.

Because our existence is without human nature,

It is said [that human nature is] void as well as finite.

An essential property of this "human nature" would be that it is unique to us, or essential to our existence. Maybe we would call it individuality: the smallest part of me that is still me.

The accepted teaching here, is apparently that human nature is finite (a). To be part of ultimate reality, paramārtha, human nature should have been infinite. Because it is not, man seems to exist without any contact with ultimate reality, therefore lacking human nature itself (c), which is identified with ultimate reality (b). That which is impermanent is called empty, śūnya, so consequently human nature must be essentially empty (d).

As theosophers we may see individuality (ātman) as a "drop of the ocean of infinity". But is it a finite drop? This constitutes a paradox or mystery, whatever you like to call it. It is finite and infinite, and it is essential that the concept of individuality represents both these aspects in one. The author of our Ekaślokaśāstra, Nāgārjuna, probably would not have agreed to this.

In The Secret Doctrine (SD) and the Voice, HPB uses the term ālaya to denote the "universal soul", a term and concept exclusive to the Yogācāra standpoint. It is even presented in the SD as a "first fundamental proposition". It seems that she makes a definite choice there in favour of the Yogācāra standpoint. In other places she refers to Mādhyamika teachings as she does here, to the Ekaślokaśāstra.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 26, 2011 at 9:49am

The Chinese word Pu-to that Edkins referred to, M. Sufilight, is the name of an island, which is considered to be the special residence of Kwan-yin/Guan-yin. So it is a very sacred place in China. But it cannot be fohat.

I have not heard of the existence of "several Kalachakra Tantra scripts in the Kham region," and do not know what this would mean. The Kalacakra Tantra was written in Sanskrit. Any form of it in any Tibetan script, whether found in Kham or any other province of Tibet, would only be the Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit original. This is available in the Kangyur.

On HPB's apparent preference for Yogacara over Madhyamaka, Ingmar, we can now see this in a new light. In recent years the so-called "Great Madhyamaka" school has become known. In 2007, in Elizabeth M.

Callahan's translation of a section of Jamgon Kongtrul Lodro Taye's book, The Treasury of Knowledge, Book Six, Part Three: Frameworks of Buddhist Philosophy, A Systematic Presentation of the Cause-Based Philosophical Vehicles (Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications), we learned that Great Madhyamaka traces its origin to the books of Maitreya. So it is a Madhyamaka system based on Yogacara texts.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 26, 2011 at 11:12am

Yes David. A few views follows....Puto is a sacred Island in China (says Blavatsky and others), even when it by some is given to be in the southern sea of India. And yes, Edkins did not actually refer to Kwan-Shai-Yin as Pu-to or Pu-ta. A stand corrected in a literal sense. But as earliere mentioned the word Pu-to and Pu-ta is also a word for Buddha. Therefore it would seem: It is not so much a question about how you write the word, but more a question about how you pronouce it, and how you read the various texts. The word must have several meanings when written. And the texts might conceal other messages and have more than one layer of content. Do you not agree?

And the question is then how you read the word(s) in various texts - whether you read the texts literally or occult. Some languages ."could be contained in another" as Blavatsky said. I mentioned that in the previous post. And also how to read Sanskrit in an occult manner as given by T. Subba Row. Are you not using this method when searhcng for the Kalachakra teachings?

(See also SD. Vol. I, p. xxii-xxiii: "The main body of the Doctrines given is found scattered throughout hundreds and thousands of Sanskrit MSS., some already translated—disfigured in their interpretations, as usual,—others still awaiting their turn. Every scholar, therefore, has an opportunity of verifying the statements herein made, and of checking most of the quotations. A few new facts (new to the profane Orientalist, only) and passages quoted from the Commentaries will be found difficult to trace. Several of the teachings, also, have hitherto been transmitted orally: yet even those are in every instance hinted at in the almost countless volumes of Brahminical, Chinese and Tibetan temple-literature.")

I will give the quotes and references one more time...

(See also Secret Doctrine, vol. I, p. 308 - "this language" ..."could be contained in another". Reading Senzar - see "The Voice of Silence" p. vi-ix - Edmontion Edition. See "THE TWELVE SIGNS OF THE ZODIAC" by T. Subba Row on reading Sanskrit in an occult manner.)

ON THE OLDEST CHINESE TRANSLITERATIONS OF THE NAME OF BUDDHA

"They were agreed only on one point that Fou-t'u came to be used earlier than Fo."

.....

"In Chinese there are more than 20 different transliterations of this name: Fo-t'o, Fou-t'o, Fou-t'ou, Pu-t'o, Pu-ta, Pu-to, Pu-t'o, Mu-t'o, Meita, Fo-ta, Pu-t'a, Fou-t'u, Fu-tou, Mu-ta, Fo-t'u, Fo, Pu-t'o, Wu-t'a, Pu-t'o, Mei-t'o etc."

http://hk.plm.org.cn/e_book/jxl/19_36.htm

On Kalachakra Tantra and Commentaries in the Kham-region...Glenn H. Mullin are referring to this in one of his books "The Practise of Kalachakra", p. 137, 139-142 (Amdo-Mongolia borderlands) and p. 143 especially. - Interesting is it not? - Maybe I should throw a quote or two form the book.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 26, 2011 at 2:10pm

In order to trace the origins of the Stanzas of Dzyan, the purpose of this discussion, we have to read Eastern texts in the same way that anyone who knows the language(s) reads them. Reading them in an occult manner would

have to do with their interpretation, not with tracing their origins in known texts. These are two different lines of inquiry.

Thanks for the reference to the Kalachakra texts in Kham, etc. These are unlikely to be anything different than what we have. From what I have seen of the Kalachakra texts written in Tibet, even those that provide interpretation necessarily follow the Tibetan translations of the original Sanskrit texts. Neither the Tibetan writers nor myself read the Kalachakra texts in an occult manner. To do so would result in loss of credibility. No one is willing to depart from the words attributed to the Buddha or to the Kings of Shambhala. Subba Row and HPB give the impression that everyone in India and Tibet reads their scriptures in an occult manner. I have seen almost none of this among Indian and Tibetan writers.

In any case, to find hidden meanings in these texts that only Theosophists can see will not show the origins of the Stanzas to interested inquirers who are not committed Theosophists. So the occult reading will not help us in the inquiry being pursued here. We have to read texts as accurately and free from interpretation as possible if we want to be taken seriously in this inquiry.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 26, 2011 at 5:09pm

M. Sufilight: the method Subba Row describes in "Twelve Signs..." is associated with reading the "tantra śāstras of India" where "very often Samskrit words are made to convey a certain hidden meaning by means of certain well-known pre-arranged methods and a tacid convention, while their literal significance is something quite different from the implied meaning".

In esoteric literature there is usually a way of saying X while implicitly referring to Y, hence the term esoteric. In Indian literature we have sandhyābhāṣā, or shadow language, which is particularly developed within esoteric Buddhism. I think it is said somewhere that

Esoterism is characterized by six options: its language can be intentional or unintentional, its expression can be literal or figurative and its meaning can be provisional or definitive.

These "six options" are essential in exegesis, however we should already have a clear picture of what is said before being able to trace the origins of a text.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 28, 2011 at 6:06am

Dear friends...A few views...

David wrote in the below: "In order to trace the origins of the Stanzas of Dzyan, the purpose of this discussion, we have to read Eastern texts in the same way that anyone who knows the language(s) reads them. Reading them in an occult manner would have to do with their interpretation, not with tracing their origins in known texts. These are two different lines of inquiry."

M. Sufilight says: Yes David...But is this really what this thread is about? I will question this...and ask the readers and contributors about their stance...What do you think?

And if you take the scholarly stance I will refer to Blavatsky's book [The Secret Doctrine vol. I, p. xxxviii-xl](#) and related pages: "But, if he cannot visit the mysterious region personally, he may still find a means of examining it from as short a distance as can be arrived at. Helped by his knowledge of landscapes left

behind him, he can get a general and pretty correct idea of the transmural view, if he will only climb to the loftiest summit of the altitudes in front of him. Once there, he can gaze at it, at his leisure, comparing that which he dimly perceives with that which he has just left below, now that he is, thanks to his efforts, beyond the line of the mists and the cloud-capped cliffs." --- and I suggest that one also read also the pages related to these words. Then I will suggest that the scholar seek to climb to that summit when seeking to trace the Dzyan Stanzas or the word "Fohat" (a Turanian compound word) in Buddhist texts. And when or if he or she does that, at the same time keep the following in mind.....
On page xliii in the Secret Doctrine Vol. I, we find Blavatsky saying that the Secret Doctrine was given by "the words of the Divine Beings"....."in Central Asia, at the very beginning of the 5th (our) race". (Ie. year 3102 BCE if we follow Blavatsky).

Now I ask where is Central Asia? - If we look in the dictionaries we find at least three definitions offered. (See also Wikipedia - http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Central_Asia). What Blavatsky meant is therefore, as I see it left to interpretation today year 2011. (Secret Doctrine. For instance Vol. I, p. 209 and vol. II, p. 204) Am I right? But we find that Blavatsky in her papers also included the sacred island in the Gobi desert as belonging to Central Asia. But the Gobi Desert were had many definitions in the 19th century - and - not always the same one used today. Luckily we have some historical info left in this example. But we might assume (perhaps with good reason) that she meant the definition given others in her time: The area which today is called Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan or so. Although Northern Afghanistan, Pakistan and India (Kashmir) and Western Tibet might have been included if we look at old maps. (See also a few 19th century maps - http://www.old-map-blog.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/Russian_conq... --- http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/0/0c/1806_Cary_Map_of... - Tartary included.) -

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 28, 2011 at 6:09am

The results of our attempt to trace fohat in known works have so far been to rule out various possibilities. This is the way much research proceeds, and is necessary and helpful. Nonetheless, it leaves us with two remaining possibilities, both equally valid: (1) fohat is an esoteric term found only in secret books; (2) fohat is an invented term found only in Blavatsky's imagination. While most of us here prefer the first possibility, lacking any direct evidence on this, we must ask if there is there any circumstantial evidence for it.

Yes, there is. We have much discussed here the dhatu, the "element," or basic "space," as being the term used in the esoteric Senzar Catechism. If one such thing can be shown to be beyond reasonable doubt, it makes others such as fohat likely. To me, the many quotations of the repeated phrase from the Buddhist scriptures saying "whether the tathagatas arise or whether the tathagatas do not arise, the dhatu remains," is convincing. But there is more. From its first occurrences in Mahatma letters in 1882, the element has been called not just the element, but the "one element." We recall that in the 1882 article "What is Matter and What is Force?," for example, the Mahatma

K.H. said about it (H. P. Blavatsky Collected Writings, vol. 4, p. 220):

"Light, then, like heat-of which it is the crown-is simply the ghost, the shadow of matter in motion, the boundless, eternal, infinite SPACE, MOTION and DURATION, the trinitarian essence of that which the Deists call God, and we--the One Element; Spirit-matter, or Matter-spirit, whose septenary properties we circumscribe under its triple abstract form in the equilateral triangle."

As we know, the dhatu is a central subject of Maitreya's book, the Ratnagotravibhaga. That book speaks frequently of the dhatu, but only in one place does it speak of the eka-dhatu, the "one element." This is in the commentary on chapter 1, verse 12. In Takasaki's translation, this is on p. 170, where he translates eka-dhatu as "the one [real] essence." In Obermiller's translation, this is on p. 136, where he translates the eka-dhatu as "the unique Germ (of Buddhahood)," as follows:

"All these different forms of defilement peculiar to the worldlings, those of passions, deeds and repeated birth, manifest themselves in this world owing to the ignorance of the unique Germ (of Buddhahood) in its true character."

The Ratnagotravibhaga bases itself on several sutras, which later came to be known as the ten "tathagatagarbha sutras." Near the beginning, the commentary tells which of the book's seven subjects come from which sutra. The teaching on the dhatu is said to come from the Anunatvapurnatva-nirdesa-parivarta. This small sutra (or section of a sutra) was not translated into Tibetan, presumably having already disappeared in India by the time of the Tibetan translations about a thousand years ago. But it was available five or six centuries earlier, when it was translated into Chinese. The Chinese translation is thus the only version of this text now available, other than quotations from it in the Ratnagotravibhaga's Sanskrit commentary.

William Grosnick studied the Chinese translation of this sutra. He prepared a Research Report on it that was published in Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan, no. 22, 1977, pp. 30-36. It is titled, "The Understanding of 'Dhatu' in the Anunatvapurnatvanirdesa."

This paper on this topic, of such extraordinary interest to us, gives us some very valuable information. It shows us that a central topic of the brief Anunatvapurnatva-nir

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 28, 2011 at 6:11am

last paragraph repeated and completed:

William Grosnick studied the Chinese translation of this sutra. He prepared a Research Report on it that was published in Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan, no. 22, 1977, pp. 30-36. It is titled, "The Understanding of 'Dhatu' in the Anunatvapurnatvanirdesa." This paper on this topic, of such extraordinary interest to us, gives us some very valuable information. It shows us that a central topic of the brief Anunatvapurnatva-nirdesa is the eka-dhatu, the "one element." Now, how

likely is it that Blavatsky came up with the "one element" out of her imagination? This article is now posted with the Stanzas documents.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 28, 2011 at 6:22am

Extra comments to the previous post....A few views more...

- Yet, this is no doubt an interpretation on our part, if we choose this definition about Central Asia. --- A similar kind of interpretation we will have to do when reading ancient Buddhist scriptures, because we cannot know with certainty what various words like "Pu-ta" or "Fou-to" meant when pronounced in various ways to those writing the early texts on Buddhism beyond the Himalayas several hundreds of years ago. And later copyists might not have known it either. - Especially if the original author of a text on Buddhism had a different intention with the manner of reading the script compared with a present day dead-letter reading prefer by a scholar - within his (narrow) chosen so-called scientific boundaries. But these are of course just my views. - Do you not agree upon this?

What I am saying is: It depends entirely upon the time when a text was written what the actual words in it the texts meant. And it also depends on whether the intention of the writer was different than the one assumed by others who were contemporary - and - perhaps orthodox. To assume that a highly philosophical and occult text was written only with a dead-letter reading in mind - is not quite scientific view as far as I am concerned. What do you think? -

The Etymology of words can easily change within a few decades according to linguists. Rejecting occult reading on the basis of scholarly limitations seem to be a non-scientific stance in my book. Etymologists and linguists have to read using non-dead letter reading and seek the meaning behind the texts, also if they use interpretation. What do think? Is a scholarly research only allowed in this thread, and are linguists barred from tracing the possible the origin of the Dzayan Stanzas?

David wrote: "Thanks for the reference to the Kalachakra texts in Kham, etc. These are unlikely to be anything different than what we have."

M. Sufilight says: Why unlikely? - Knowledge is not assumption. And you asked, and I offered a view and a question. After all that region has produced quite a number of high initiated Arhats within Buddhism through the centuries.

David wrote: "Neither the Tibetan writers nor myself read the Kalachakra texts in an occult manner."...."Subba Row and HPB give the impression that everyone in India and Tibet reads their scriptures in an occult manner. I have seen almost none of this among Indian and Tibetan writers."....."We have to read texts as accurately and free from interpretation as possible if we want to be taken seriously in this inquiry."

M. Sufilight says: Then those Tibetans are not real esoteric Initiated Tibetans. And clearly not occultists. Smile. If they only are willing to read the texts in a dead-letter manner, and not at all seek to use the Akasha when reading, they ought to be called Orthodox Buddhists. - Subba Row and Blavatsky might have hinted at that in the 19th century. We live in a different time, a lot have changed in Tibet since that time. Do you not think so?

I ask: What is accurate reading at all?

(See also page xxiii + page xlii - in the Secret Doctrine, vol. I: "A few new facts (new to the profane Orientalist, only) and passages quoted from the Commentaries will be found difficult to trace. Several of the teachings, also, have

hitherto been transmitted orally: yet even those are in every instance hinted at in the almost countless volumes of Brahminical, Chinese and Tibetan temple-literature."....."It is the only original copy now in existence." --- and related info and pages.)

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 28, 2011 at 6:38am

A question.

ParaSakti, JnanaSakti, ItchaSakti, KriyaSakti, KundaliniSakti, MantrikaSakti, and their synthesis named Davi-Prakriti (Fohat)

(See The Secret Doctrine Vol. I, p. 292-293)

http://www.phx-ult-lodge.org/SDVolume_1.htm

What do you call the above Hindu terms in Tibetan and Chinese? And is their synthesis always left out in the texts? - I do not think so.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 28, 2011 at 1:14pm

On the upload of the manuscript of Sinnett's Cosmological Notes: the fifth human principle, "physical ego", in BL 378, is spelled Ngë in the manuscript instead of Ngi, as David remarked in his Notes on Cosmological Notes. This might be Tibetan nged, I, me, Sanskrit aham, a synonym for nga, which is also used for "ego", so found in the [Tibetan-English Dictionary of Buddhist Culture](#) from Rangjung Yeshe Publications. Cf. nga med, egolessness, not thinking of one's self-interest; nga 'dzin, ego-clinging, holding to a self; nga rgyal, [egocentric] pride, arrogance, conceit, egocentricity, egotism; etc.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on November 28, 2011 at 1:34pm

>"....."in Central Asia, at the very beginning of the 5th (our) race". (Ie. year 3102 BCE if we follow Blavatsky).

A strange interpretation. Me thought that our Aryan race sui generis is 1 million years old as it was 200,000 years old when Atlantis sunk. How then can the Aryan only 5,000 years old? Dead-letter interpretation of an occult statement

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 28, 2011 at 2:43pm

On the third human principle, Chhu-lung: in [Jim Valby's](#) dictionary, in the lemma [rlung](#), a chu'i rlung, [vibration of cohesion, water wind](#), is mentioned, one of five bodily humours. In the lemma text "three body humours" (3 airs?) are mentioned. There is no list of the three humours there.

Comment by [M. Sufilight](#) on November 28, 2011 at 3:58pm

Dear Frank

My views are: My mistake. Sorry about that. Secret Doctrine Vol. II, p. 313-314 and p. 715. The fifth Root Race appeared about 1 million years ago. - I stand corrected, and we will have to say that about 1-2 million years ago is the correct number to give if we follow Blavatsky's words, and Master KH (Letter 23b.) - Thank you for correcting that. Sometimes the hands will not follow the head and heart. Smile.

A few views...I wonder if the Dzyan Stanzas are shown in temples at Peshawar and Taxila in Pakistan where Aryasanga or Asanga was said to be born. (Sanskrit had its cradle in that area says Blavatsky quoting Kennedy in SD, Vol. I p. xxxi. And science confirm Vedic teaching in that area and further to the West more and more today.) (The Harappa culture was advanced compared to other cultures at the same time. They already had flush-toilets and other things year 2.500 BCE. The culture has also been traced to Kashmir and Punjab. [Vinea script 5-3.000 BCE](#) - [Sumerian Script](#) - [early Chinese](#) - scroll the page. And from Wikipedia: [Brahmi script](#) - [History of writing](#) - [Indus script](#) - A hint to a common mutual language - before the Tower of Babel?) Blavatsky wrote in the Voice of Silence: "The original Precepts are engraved on thin oblong squares; copies very often on discs. These discs, or plates, are generally preserved on the altars of the temples attached to centres where the so-called "contemplative" or Mahâyâna (Yogachârya) schools are established." (p. vii, Edmonton Edition). Aryasanga was behind the Yogacara Mahayana School. And some of the early Mahayana schools was created there in 349 bc. or earlier. - There was an early Mahayana School near the Himalayas - named Haimavata. Was it related to the Masters of Haimavatas?

Kasyapiya School (The Haimavatas School)

(It is one of the early Mahayana Buddhistic schools. They were known as the Haimavatas School. They wore magnolia colored robes. They denied that the Arhats were without faults etc. According to some they descended from the Vibhajyavada School.)

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/K%C4%81%C5%9Byap%C4%ABya>

Bodhidharma (5-6th century AD) is said to have been behind the Chinese esoteric Schools according to Blavatsky as far as I can read her. (BCW vol. XIV, p. 447 - Blavatsky hints at Jainism here and also elsewhere.). He must likely have known about the Kalachakra Tantra.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 28, 2011 at 6:30pm

In reply to the following:

David wrote in the below: "In order to trace the origins of the Stanzas of Dzyan, the purpose of this discussion, we have to read Eastern texts in the same way that anyone who knows the language(s) reads them. Reading them in an occult manner would have to do with their interpretation, not with tracing their origins in known texts. These are two different lines of inquiry."

M. Sufilight says: Yes David...But is this really what this thread is about? I will question this...and ask the readers and contributors about their stance...What do you think?

I think that Joe would be the one to answer this, since he started this discussion.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 28, 2011 at 6:45pm

I see that Ingmar has found the newly posted Cosmological Notes in Sinnett's handwritten manuscript. This is posted here thanks to Jerry Hejka-Ekins, who made this print-out for me from a microfilm of the Mahatma papers, and sent it to me some years ago. This is the nearest thing we have to the original text of what is one of the most important documents for the study of the original ideas and terms connected with the Stanzas of Dzyan. Here in the Cosmological Notes

from the fall of 1881 we have the first mention of fohat, and the first statement of many of the terms and ideas found several years later in The Secret Doctrine. The original, in the possession of Hume, was probably in Morya's handwriting, and Sinnett copied it. Unfortunately, Sinnett's handwriting is atrocious, and so is Morya's judging from other specimens of it that we have. At least some of the errors that we have to deal with in tracing these terms stem from illegible handwriting.

Comment by [Capt. Anand Kumar](#) on November 28, 2011 at 6:51pm

I would say, for whatever it is worth, that David Reigle's approach is scientific, genuine and worthy of our times. He is seeking textual sources and not answers through personal, subjective experience. That is how scholarly search should be conducted, IMHO.

Comment by [Joe Fulton](#) on November 28, 2011 at 9:15pm

David's interpretation of the purpose of this form is precise and correct.

The purpose of this forum is to conduct a rational, scholarly investigation into the historical, factual origins of the Stanzas of Dzyan, to be verified independently of internal, "Theosophical" sources.

I posted a warning at the top of the discussion under "A further note" regarding the use of "internal sources".

We strongly discourage the usual practice of internal referencing (saying "our text is true because the text says it is"). That is the same type of activity that fundamentalists of all stripes engage in. We have a much higher standard to uphold and anything we can do to support the work of serious researchers like David, Jacques and Ingmar will be done to the best of our ability.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 29, 2011 at 8:57am

M. Sufilight: I have already implicitly stated my understanding of the purpose of this blog on November 26 and 7, 2011. I think Joe has formulated the purpose very clearly in his first post September 20, 2010, which is shown at the top of this blog. I certainly agree with Capt. Kumar in his latest post.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 30, 2011 at 9:57am

Regarding fohat, we are still seeking:

1. any reference to the term "father-mother" in Eastern texts (re: SD 1.98 fn.).
2. any reference to "knots" of something that could be fohat (re: Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge, and SD Commentaries).
3. any reference to daivi-prakriti in the Yoga-Vasistha (possibly T. Subba Row's source). Our Indian members can help with this, since there are apparently one or more good translations of the Yoga-Vasistha into Hindi. We do not have a reliable English translation of this large text.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 30, 2011 at 11:13am

Regarding the six options or six alternatives (ṣaṭ-koṭi):
"its language can be intentional or unintentional, its expression can be literal or figurative and its meaning can be provisional or definitive."

These are found in the Jnana-vajra-samuccaya, one of the so-called expository tantras to the Guhyasamaja-tantra, and are explained in Candrakirti's Pradipoddyotana commentary on the Guhyasamaja-tantra. The Jnana-vajra-samuccaya has not yet been recovered in Sanskrit, and is available only in its Tibetan translation. The Pradipoddyotana has been published in Sanskrit as edited by Chintaharan Chakravarti in 1984 in the Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, no. 25 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute). However, as everyone who has used this edition knows, it is quite faulty, because it was not checked with the Tibetan translation during editing. A new critical edition is being published serially in Dhih: Journal of the Rare Buddhist Texts Research Unit. Chapters 1 and 2 were published in no. 48, 2009; chapters 3 to 6 in no. 49, 2010, and chapters 7 to 9 in no. 50, 2010, of seventeen total chapters. There is no English translation. These six alternatives are supposed to apply to the Guhyasamaja-tantra, but I have not seen them applied to other tantras.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 30, 2011 at 12:13pm

On nged, "I, me," for the fifth human principle in the Cosmological Notes (published as an appendix to The Letters of H. P. B. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett), this is probably the best hypothesis so far for the Tibetan word transcribed as Ngë (rather than the printed Ngi). The two difficulties we have with these words are that: (1) we cannot rely on their transcription; and (2) no scheme of the seven principles has so far been found in use in Tibetan writings to compare them with. Given these two facts, I think we must still regard this word as unidentified, until we can find it used in this way.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on November 30, 2011 at 1:01pm

The three bodily humors or doshas taught in Indian Ayurvedic medicine, and adopted in Tibetan medicine, are:

1. Skt. vata, Tib. rlung, Eng. wind.
2. Skt. pitta, Tib. mkhris pa, Eng. bile.
3. Skt. kapha, Tib. bad kan, Eng. phlegm.

These do not seem to be related to the third human principle in the Cosmological Notes, Chhu-lung (possibly chu'i rlung, water-wind).

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on November 30, 2011 at 2:28pm

The word 'knots' is used to indicate 'foci of consciousness' or as 'condensation or foci of energy' as in the seven centres or chakras. Another text that comes to mind that uses the term 'knots' are the Agni Yoga texts of Helen Roerich. Alice Bailey uses it in the same context of the seven centres of force. HR uses it to describe karmic binds or occurrences of destiny, as "karmic knots" or "cosmic knots". She also speaks of the 'fires' centres and knots together. HPB regarding Fohat uses an interesting word construction in this regard which is "Fohat the "knot-tier."

This is also discussed by Blavatsky as a 'rope of karma' or karmic rope. The 'thread of primaevial light' or thread or cord theme runs through esoteric literature and many traditions. It is also said by HPB to be represented in the illustration Elihu Vedder to the Quatrains of Omar Khayyam and as Japanese carvings being symbolic. A karmic knot can be traced to Hindu astrology. Gandanta can mean a node or grouping of asterisms or conjunction of stars or planets in a horoscope. Note the use of the word 'node' which is synonymous with knot in the same context. 'Knots of karma' are also mentioned in the Bhagavad Gita xv.2

Gandanta – the karmic knot

Main article: Gandanta

Gandanta (Sanskrit: gandanta, from gand, 'knot', and anta, 'end'.) Gandanta is a spiritual or karmic knot in Hindu astrology. Gandanta describes the junction points in the natal chart where the solar and lunar zodiacs meet, and are directly associated with times of soul growth.[24]

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hindu_astrology

Here it is indicated there is one match for 'knot of karma':

<http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=aKTRAAAMAAJ&q=knot+of+karma...>

Śankaradeva and his times:

(1449—1568 AD).

early history of the Vaiṣṇava faith and movement in Assam

1 page matching knot of karma in this book

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on November 30, 2011 at 3:43pm

On the six alternatives: I quoted Vimalaprabhā I.4.1.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 1, 2011 at 10:23am

Thank you, Ingmar, for your source reference on the six alternatives. I did not remember that they were mentioned in the Vimalaprabha. Upon checking, I see that they are given in a verse from the lost mula Kalacakra-tantra quoted in the Vimalaprabha (Sarnath edition, vol. 1, p. 35, lines 22-23, available on this website in the Sanskrit Buddhist documents section). This would certainly imply that they are meant to be applied to Buddhist tantric writings in general, and not only to the Guhyasamaja writings. Although I have only seen them systematically applied in Candrakīrti's Pradīpodyotana commentary on the Guhyasamaja-tantra, it makes sense that they could be and would be applicable to many texts.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 1, 2011 at 10:45am

The Hevajratāntra and its commentary Yogaratnamālā have a larger passage on the particular sandhyābhāṣa of this system, in 3.53-67. In the laḡhu Kālacakratāntra the code language phenomenon is of course less prominent, but present.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 2, 2011 at 5:41pm

On "knots of karma," these do not appear to refer to fohat as they are used in the few texts that use them. Nonetheless, karma as a technical term in the Hindu

Vaisesika system, where it has been translated as "motion," could possibly refer to something like fohat. A description of this from Umesha Mishra's 1936 book, *Conception of Matter in Nyaya-Vaisesika*, pp. 196-223, was posted in Jon Fergus's Karma discussion on Nov. 27:

http://api.ning.com/files/m*EUDNNFaXpi6Y1paOPJsmwahgTkHP*Bs9TDLIago...

–
–
–

This is not easy reading, but in this chapter Umesha Mishra has put this teaching about as clearly as can be done. The Sanskrit Vaisesika texts are as complex as any technical manuals on science. Other descriptions of this can be found in English in Brajendranath Seal's 1915 book, *The Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus*, pp. 129-152, and in Surendranath Dasgupta's posthumously published book, *Natural Science of the Ancient Hindus*, pp. 24-29.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 3, 2011 at 3:18pm

1. Dgyu, ending

Another interesting detail in the manuscript of Sinnett's [Cosmological Notes](#) is the fact that the first time they are mentioned, Dgyu and Dgyu Mi both carry an umlaut (Dgyü). In ML 35, Dgyu is spelled as dgiü, also with umlaut. The u-umlaut sound in common Tibetan is only produced when a syllable ends in -ud or -us. This would narrow down the possibilities for the orthography of Dgyu.

Some of the umlauts in the text seem to have been added later, perhaps at the same time the annotations were interscribed, including the underlined title "Appendix II" on top of page 2. The annotations do not seem to be in the same handwriting as the original notes. Compare for example the capital A of the word Appendix with the capital A's in the manuscript text. In *The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to A.P. Sinnett* (BL) the Notes appear as Appendix II. It is therefore entirely possible that the annotations and also the umlauts are the handwriting of the transcriber/compiler of the book, A.T. Barker. This would be consistent with the spelling in the ML edited by Barker. The umlauts on Dgyü and Dgyü Mi however, are not reproduced in BL. In Jinarajadasa's edition (ETM) of the Notes the umlauts are absent as well.

2. Dgyu, front part

In Jinarajadasa's edition, a remark of Sinnett is added, telling that M. himself "wrote out" the table of correspondences between Man and Universe. This means that Sinnett has copied the table from the writing of M., instead of interpreting the words from hearing. Interestingly, in the table, Linga Sharira is called Ling Sharir in line 3, we also have Bhut, Purush, Brahm, dropping the final a's, as in the Sanskrit pronunciation typical of speakers of modern Hindi. Apparently M's concern was that the words were written as they were pronounced, as opposed to how they were written in the original language. The rendering of the Tibetan terms is therefore presumably also a phonetic transcription for an English target audience. The D in Dgyu could not have been a silent letter then. Also, English has two sounds associated with the letter g (besides /ŋ/ in "thing"), the plosive /g/ and the affricate /dʒ/. The dg-combination does not exist with a plosive /g/-sound in English, so our dgy-combination would probably be the affricate /dʒ/, the g-sound in "gin", or something close to it. This is consistent with HPB's spelling Dzyu, for example in SD I, 108. The /dʒ/, and phonemes very close to it, are listed in the following table.

possible phonemes for front part, written in Tibetan

1. palato-alveolar /dz/ = pya, bya, ...
2. alveolo-palatal /dʒ/ or /ndʒ/ = mja, 'ja
3. alveolo-palatal /tʃ/ = ra
4. retroflex /dz/ or /ndz/ = 'dra, 'gra, ...
5. palatal /nj/ = 'gya
6. palatal /c/ with deep tone = brgya, bsgya, dgya, bgya, rgya, sgya, ...
7. palatal /ch/ with deep tone = gya

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 3, 2011 at 3:22pm

(continued from previous post)

3. Dgyu, orthography

Combining the ideas on front part and ending, we could try finding some matching candidates for Dgyu, using a digital lexicon (Rangjung Yeshe). Elements we may look for are "real (magical) knowledge, dealing with eternal truths and primal causes" (SD I,108), and the negation Dgyu Mi, or min or med, "illusion and false appearances only" (SD I,108).

1. rgyus = knowledge, [..], intelligence, [..]

rgyus med = having no knowledge, familiarity, unknowingly

rgyus is also the instrumental case of rgyu, cause, meaning because.

rgyu = causal basis, causality, cause, primary cause, [..], ingredient / cause, causal basis, stuff, object, property, wealth, material [object], [..]

rgyus is also a verb form of the verb rgyu ba.

rgyu ba = 1) to go, walk, move, wander, range, [..], enter, [..] 2) moving energy, movement, the mobile [living]

2. brgyud = to transmit, conduct, send, channel through, stream through, [..], pass on, [..], connected, linked, to be chained together, [..], lineage, [..], cp. brgyud pa = lineage of transmission, transmission, lineage, to be transmitted, [..], progeny, offspring, heredity, origin, birth, generation, [..]

brgyud certainly has some of the elements, but seems too far removed from the Dzyu from the SD. I have not found a brgyud med or brgyud min.

4. Dgyu = rgyus?

rgyus might be a realistic candidate for Dgyu, matching HPB's definition at first glance. The spelling Dgyü, with an umlaut, following A.T. Barker, would then be justified. Of course more possibilities might be explored.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 3, 2011 at 9:37pm

[Delete Comment](#)

What Ingmar has posted is exactly the type of inquiry that I hoped for regarding the Cosmological Notes. We need to systematically investigate the unidentified terms used in them, one by one. When Sinnett's manuscript of them was posted last week, I had hoped to provide an introduction to them. I now do so.

The Cosmological Notes mark a major turning point in the Theosophical material given out. They bring out, for the first time, terms such as fohat, ideas such as "space" for the ultimate, and others found several years later, when the bringing out of this teaching culminated in the publication of the Stanzas of Dzyan in The Secret Doctrine. The Cosmological Notes were written by Morya (not by K.H.), and sent to A. O. Hume (not to A. P. Sinnett). The original in Morya's handwriting, once in the possession of Hume, has not become available, and is presumed lost. What is posted here is Sinnett's handwritten copy that he made from Morya's original in Hume's possession. This means that the original in Morya's hard to read handwriting was copied by Sinnett in his hard to read handwriting. The end result is that the spellings of words found in it cannot be fully relied on.

The Cosmological Notes were not included in the Mahatma Letters, either in the first (1923), second (1926), or third revised (1962) editions, but only added to the chronological edition (1993). They were published as an appendix in The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett (1925), and most of them were included in the earlier book prepared by Jinarajadasa, The Early Teachings of the Masters (1923). I have prepared some "Notes on Cosmological Notes," published in Blavatsky's Secret Books (1999). The Cosmological Notes were written in the fall of 1881, preceding the follow-up January 1882 Mahatma letter #13 on Cosmological Notes.

Sinnett, in an important introduction to them that was not included when they were published in the HPB Letters, had titled them, "Notes from the Book of Kiu-te." This is printed in The Early Teachings of the Masters. I will post it in a separate post.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 3, 2011 at 9:44pm

[Delete Comment](#)

A. P. Sinnett introduced the Cosmological Notes as follows (The Early Teachings of the Masters, 1923):

"Notes from the Book of Kiu-te, the great repository of occult lore in the keeping of the Adepts in Tibet. I believe there are thirty or forty volumes, a great deal shown only to Initiates. What follows is merely some elementary catechism in the very beginning. We began to get these notes through Madame Blavatsky when Mr. Hume and I first set to work together. But we soon got off on to other lines of rail.

"The very first thing I ever had in the way of philosophical teaching I sent you a copy of last year; it was a sketch of the chain of worlds which I suppose you have somewhere still. Then we got in a fragmentary way the materials on which Hume wrote the first of the 'Occult Fragments'--that relating to the seven principles in man. It is necessary to have an absolute comprehension of that division at starting. It runs through all nature in various shapes and ways. I now copy out of my MS. book. A.P.S."

These Cosmological Notes circulated among the early students of Theosophy under the title, "Notes from the Book of Kiu-te." This may be seen from Francesca Arundale's comment made in her book titled, My Guest--H. P. Blavatsky, p. 14 (Adyar, Madras: Theosophical Publishing House, 1932):

"I have among my papers a copy of some early notes that were sent to us, entitled Notes from the Book of Kiu Ti, a most metaphysical and philosophical discourse, strikingly different from the explanatory teaching of a later date."

Comment by [morry secrest](#) on December 4, 2011 at 12:11pm

On the origin of the word "fohat":

Our local library has a book, "A Tibetan English Dictionary" by Sarat Chandra Das. First published in 1902, it has been reprinted by Asian Educational Services in New Delhi and Madras, in 1989.

I became curious as to whether there is any word in Tibetan which ends in "-at" or "-hat". After a cursory examination of this dictionary, I came away with the impression that words ending in a vowel are by far more common than words ending in a consonant. Further, words ending in -t are very rare. I was able to find only one; it is the exclamatory "phat" which is felt to have some power in destroying evil spirits. This word "phat" is found on page 819, and is explained with a quotation from Milarepa as to three aspects or meanings of the word. There is a similarity with the syllable "had", which has the meaning of "Let alone!" and "Be off!", and is found on page 1327.

There is no instance of "fo" in this dictionary, that I could find; but I did see usage of the syllable written as "pho". Listed on page 827, it is associated with the male sex among animals, and with masculine generative energy. It has another interesting association also, as on page 828, "pho-na" is listed as "a messenger". HPB makes this association in one of her usages of "fohat".

All of this does not bring us closer to finding the source of the word, fohat. It does, however, show that the two syllables are used in Tibetan and that among their range of meanings are a few that seem reminiscent of HPB's definitions and usage of "fohat". This would suggest that the word "fohat" could be Tibetan in origin.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on December 4, 2011 at 2:03pm

Cosmological notes: M. Dgyu becomes Fohat when in its activity --- active agent of will-electricity --- no other name.

JC: In 'Cosmological notes' M relates as do other Masters and arhats, Fohat to electricity, though it can be differentiated of course. These are some thoughts on Fohat, motion and karma.

(6) What things are co-existent with space?

M. (i) Duration.

(ii) Matter.

(iii)

Motion, for this is the imperishable life (conscious or unconscious as the case may be) of matter, even during the pralaya, or night of mind.

When Chyang or omniscience, and Chyang-mi-shi-khon --- ignorance, both sleep, this latent unconscious life still maintains the matter it animates in sleepless unceasing

motion.

(iv) The Akasa (Bar-nang) or Kosmic atmosphere, or Astral light, or celestial ether, which whether in its latent or active condition, surrounds and interpenetrates all matter in motion of which it is at once a result and the medium by which the Kosmic energy acts on its source.

JC: Appreciation for the link on 'Conception of Matter, David. On "karmic knots" or "cosmic knots", here are the three prime requisites for karmic action and re-

action. 1. Duration or a manifestation of a period of time such as a Manvantara. 2. Space or matter as an entity. 3. The motion of that matter in karmic action or activity. 'Karman' is action and appears to be Sanskrit for Karma. It is used by M in 'Cosmological notes'.

Karma is related closely to the 'One life' as HPB states in the Secret Doctrine. She states also, "Fohat is closely related to the "ONE LIFE." SD1 110. HPB also states "The ONE LIFE is closely related to the one law which governs the World of Being -- KARMA." SD1 634. Fohat and Karma are then 'closely related' as they are with "Motion, the ONE LIFE" from the same source. Fohat, Karma, Motion and the ONE LIFE are closely related. HPB regarding Fohat uses an interesting word construction in this regard which is "Fohat the "knot-tier."

M. States, conditions, call it whatever you please. I call it

Kyen --- cause; itself a result of a previous or some primary cause./body>

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on December 4, 2011 at 2:06pm

M. States, conditions, call it whatever you please. I call it

Kyen --- cause; itself a result of a previous or some primary cause.

Fohat

, who, vibrating along Akasa, Od (a state of cosmic matter, motion, force, etc.) runs along the lines of cosmic manifestations and frames all and everything; blindly --- agreed, yet as faithfully in accordance with the prototypes as conceived in the eternal mind as a good mirror reflects your face.

Your all-pervading supreme power exists, but it is exactly matter, whose life is motion, will, and nerve power, electricity. Cosmological notes.

JC: Fohat [electricity or its result] is here described by Master M from Cosmological notes as framing cosmic matter via motion, force in accordance to original prototypes or thought. Karma is the effect of action arising from the original intention or motion or motive cause or Karman. A karmic effect is a karmic knot (Sk-

Gandanta – the karmic knot) or recurring non original energy field that needs to be re formed to the original motion of the Fohatic ONE LIFE.

"Design is Kyen, a cause arising from a primary one." HPB Letters. 386.

□

"Karman is action, the Cause; and Karma again is "the law of ethical causation"; the effect of an act." SD2 302.

"action or act (karman) to the Linga-sarira"; FYT.

"Karma, the law of ethical causation; the effect of an act for the attainment of an object of personal desire, merit and demerit.

□

Karman, action ; attributes of Linga Sarira." FYT.

"the dominion of Destiny [Karman], and we become, so to say, arbiters of our own fate." BCW XI 235.

karma: कर्मन् [karman](#) n. [work](#) कर्मन्

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on December 4, 2011 at 2:06pm

karma: कर्मन् [karman](#) n. [work](#) कर्मन् [karman](#) n. [act](#) [action] कर्मन् [karman](#) n. [action](#) Sanskrit Dictionary.

"Very definition of motion (karman)." Conception of Matter. ChV 200.

[studies in japanese buddhism - Google Books Result](#)

books.google.co.uk/books?isbn=1440062617...

Predisposition or Action (Sk. Karman or Samskara, Jap. Gyo).

"Fohat is closely related to the "ONE LIFE." SD1 110.

"The ONE LIFE is closely related to the one law which governs the World of Being -- KARMA."SD1 634.

"Motion, the ONE LIFE" SD1 50.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 5, 2011 at 6:58am

In the [Cosmological Notes](#) manuscript there is also an annotation "manas", which is not reproduced in the book (BL), in the table of principles next to the fifth human principle, in English, "Animal Soul".

In Sinnett's Esoteric Buddhism (EB) (in my 1892 edition on pages 30-31) there is an explanation about the fifth human principle, which was called animal soul earlier, but is now called human soul, or manas, while the fourth principle is now called animal soul, or kama rupa. The table of human principles from BL changes significantly because of this.

Tibetan (Notes)	Tibetan (Orthogr.)	Sanskrit (EB)	English (EB)
1 A-ku	sku	rupa	body
2 Zer	zer	prana or jiva	vitality
3 Chhu-lung	[?]	linga sharira	astral body
4 Nga Zhi	[?]	kama rupa	animal soul
5 Ngi	[?]	manas	human soul
6 Lana-Sem-Nyed	bla na sems nyid	buddhi	spiritual soul
7 Hlün Düb	lhun grub	atma	spirit

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 5, 2011 at 3:13pm

[Delete Comment](#)

On rgyus for dgyu or dzyu, this does appear to best match HPB's definition at first glance among the possible words known to us. I have been checking some sources on this, to verify that it is not the standard translation of any Sanskrit term. This, I think, is a strike against it. We have every reason to believe that the Senzar texts were translated or transformed into classical Sanskrit texts, which were then translated into Chinese and also into Tibetan.

There is still the great problem of illegible handwriting. We do not know if we are looking for dgyu or dzyu or jyu or something else. The follow-up Mahatma letter #13 will be posted shortly, so that we can all see Morya's handwriting, which was then put into Sinnett's handwriting. I think you have to be highly clairvoyant to be able to read either of these. At least, I cannot make out many words in them.

As for the meaning, there IS a word used regularly in the Books of Kiu-te or the Tibetan Buddhist tantras to refer to the "real knowledge," but this word is jnana or Dzyan, Tibetan ye shes. This is nothing like dgyu or dzyu. Further, I have never heard of any kind of knowledge that can become fohat, as in Stanza 5.2, "The Dzyu becomes Fohat."

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on December 5, 2011 at 3:36pm

Stanza III.

12. THEN SVABHAVAT SENDS FOHAT TO HARDEN THE ATOMS.

"Fohat hardens the atoms"; i.e., by infusing energy into them: he scatters the atoms or primordial matter. "He scatters himself while scattering matter into atoms" (MSS. Commentaries.)

It is through Fohat that the ideas of the Universal Mind are impressed upon matter." SD1 30. HPB.

Stanza XI.

"The matter of Fohat circulateth, and its fire hardeneth all the forms. The wheel that is not glimpsed moveth in rapid revolution within the slower outer case, till it weareth out the form... The many circulate. The forms are built, become too firm, are broken by the life, and circulate again. TCF 31. AAB.

"Fohat hardens and scatters the seven brothers" SD1 76.

"Mongols say hada for "a rock," hat'ago, for the adjective "hard," hat'aho for the neuter verb "to harden," and hadaho, "to make fast" (by hammering), hat'agaho, "to dry," "to harden," in causative or transitive sense." China's place in Philology.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on December 5, 2011 at 3:36pm

"Mongols say hada for "a rock," hat'ago, for the adjective "hard," hat'aho for the neuter verb "to harden," and hadaho, "to make fast" (by hammering), hat'agaho, "to dry," "to harden," in causative or transitive sense." China's place in Philology.

Joseph Edkins - 1871 p181/2. google books.

JC: key searches: Turanian Compounds, hat and Fo referring to Japanese Budzu equating near to Chinese Fo with Buddha. See, hat'agaho "to dry" to harden in transitive state as with fire to harden and dry.

[http://books.google.co.uk/books?](http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=6OtwizkhGzEC&pg=PR8&lpg=...)

[id=6OtwizkhGzEC&pg=PR8&lpg=...](http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=6OtwizkhGzEC&pg=PR8&lpg=...)Turanian+compound&source=bl&ots=ml_NIBgBE2&sig=2Yk40A-UmKHMkmH2dv_RH_Jlinw&hl=en&ei=iTbdTurcEY_dsga1k-CFDA&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=2&ved=0CCUQ6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q=hat&f=false

"Q. Can you say what is the real meaning of the word Fohat?"

A. The word is a Turanian compound and its meanings are various. In China Pho, or

Fo, is the word for "animal soul," the vital Nephesh or the breath of life. BCW X 354.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 5, 2011 at 3:49pm

A few comments on motion: The usual words for motion in Sanskrit are gati, gamana, calana, carana, etc. The word karma as a technical term in the Hindu Vaisesika school, where some have translated it as "motion," while others stay with its usual translation as "action," is different from karma in its normal sense. Most, if not all, references to karma in Theosophical sources use karma in its normal sense: the one law of action and reaction, or karmic recompense. Here it would not mean motion per se. The idea of karmic knots, karma-granthi, refers to karmic recompense coming together and typically forming a blockage on the path of progress. Again, this would not mean motion as such. The gandanta used in astrology is even farther from this in meaning. The term ganda does not in other contexts mean a knot. Its normal meaning is the cheek of the face. Even in gandanta a node is probably a better translation of it.

If we look to a system such as Vaisesika for a teaching of motion as a principle in nature, and find it as "karma," we would also have to look to other Indian systems, such as the Jaina system, where we find the principle of motion as "dharma." In many others systems, we do not find any idea of motion as a cosmic principle or a principle in nature. We just see it used in the everyday sense, such as saying that a cart is in motion. This type of motion is famously denied by Nagarjuna in the second chapter of his Mula-madhyamaka-karika. As for kyen, this is the Tibetan word rkyen, which translates the Sanskrit word pratyaya, "condition," when used in juxtaposition with hetu, Tibetan rgyu, "cause." Thus, hetu and pratyaya, or rgyu and rkyen, refer to causes and conditions. The causes are primary causes, and conditions are secondary causes. As M. says, kyen is a condition or "cause; itself a result of a previous or some primary cause."

In the Cosmological Notes, where the term "motion" that we are seeking to identify is found, it is once given as "khor wa." This is an identifiable Tibetan word, 'khor ba, the normal translation of the Sanskrit samsara, and also of words for motion such as bhramana. These have the sense of going in a circle or revolving. But it is clear that samsara, in its normal meaning of the cycle of birth and death and rebirth, can hardly be the motion that the Cosmological Notes speak of, that exists even during pralaya. It so happens that the Vaisesika technical term karma does refer to motion or action that exists even during pralaya, as we learn from the beginning of Umesha Mishra's chapter. In investigating this further, we are hindered by lack of primary sources in Sanskrit. The great early Vaisesika commentaries are lost. We have only some quotations from them. Even among the commentaries we have, important ones such as the Kiranavali, the Vyomavati, and the Candrananda-vritti, have not been translated into English. Regarding the Jaina system and its principle of motion called "dharma," there is no pralaya in this system.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 5, 2011 at 8:00pm

This is a helpful observation, Ingmar, that the description of the seven human principles changed a little by the time of Sinnett's 1883 book, Esoteric Buddhism. That manas is meant here for the fifth principle is a real possibility. But I am not

sure that Sinnett's added word there is really manas. It looks like it ends in "y" rather than "s." Can anyone make out what the added word is below this one?

Comment by [Joe Fulton](#) on December 5, 2011 at 8:56pm

"The great early Vaisesika commentaries are lost. We have only some quotations from them..."

Are there any rumors that these commentaries exist anywhere that can be tracked down?

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 5, 2011 at 9:52pm

At the time HPB wrote in the Introductory to the SD about the great underground libraries of the initiates that contained copies of all the lost works, the only Sanskrit commentary on the Vaisesika-sutras that was available was the Upaskara by Sankara-misra. No one even suspected that others might be found. Then, between 1957 and 1985, four hitherto unavailable recently discovered commentaries were published. These gave us a much more satisfactory text of the Vaisesika-sutras, with more satisfactory explanations. They are posted on this website, and were described in a March 31, 2011 post: <http://theosnet.ning.com/forum/topics/online-sanskrit-texts-project...> They are texts of intermediate age, and do not yet bring us to the early still lost commentaries by Atreya, Ravana, Bharadvaja, etc. But they take us a big step closer. Who can say when the early ones will be discovered?

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on December 6, 2011 at 2:44am

on 2nd principle: prana or jiva - I read "pranā jivatma" instead under Chhu-lung I read "one of the 3 aims"

this last s on aims looks like the s on the manas in question, only hastier written = "manas mayavi" or the unreal manas or the lower manas

"Hlün Dhüb" with a h

"atman Mayava=rupa."

"Lana-Sem-nyed (spiritual soul)"

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 7, 2011 at 3:34am

Frank: it seems to me, all of these are more or less explicable, except for 1. pranā and 2. the word below manas. As for the latter, I am not sure if you are right on this. The y in "mayava" below looks quite different. I think I have seen a sample of A.T. Barker's handwriting somewhere. Maybe this could be helpful, especially if the writing proves to be his.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on December 7, 2011 at 4:49am

Ingmar, yes, the y in the supposed "mayava" below the supposed "manas" looks different. My guess is that it is hastily written. I am not even sure whether the

first letter is an m or an n. The second can only be an a, the third could be an y or even an p, although the other p's look different. We should consult an handwriting expert.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 7, 2011 at 5:19am

On second thought: maybe "Mayava=rupa" (5th human principle) looks more like Sinnett's writing, with the guirlande-style M.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 7, 2011 at 5:37am

Maybe a handwriting expert would also enjoy a few hours of studying the [Mahatma letter 13 manuscript](#), as I did yesterday evening, or, alternatively, framing it as an abstract work of art...

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 7, 2011 at 3:17pm

Well, I much enjoyed our first comment on the manuscript of Mahatma letter 13: frame it as an abstract work of art. Anyone who looks at it will see just how appropriate this comment is. Humorous, but its truth will be seen when one tries to read it.

On the illegible second word added to the fifth human principle in the Cosmological Notes, it appears to start with "map." The third letter looks quite like how Sinnett makes his "p"s in the words across from it. The initial "m" might be something other than "m."

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 9, 2011 at 9:56pm

No one has yet commented on the article about the dhatu in the Anunatvapurnatvanirdesa, posted with the Stanzas documents about ten days ago, and discussed in my post of Nov. 28. As there indicated, I regard this as quite an important piece of information. The eka-dhatu, the "one element," is a central topic of the text stated to be the source of the Ratna-gotra-vibhaga's teaching on the dhatu. This text has been lost in India for nearly 1500 years, and never went to Tibet. Yet, the Mahatmas, or HPB, or whoever we want to regard as the author of their letters, teach the "one element." The question I ended with was more than just rhetorical. I really would like to know, "how likely is it that Blavatsky came up with the 'one element' out of her imagination?"

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 11, 2011 at 5:44am

Regarding David's earlier question seeking for "1. any reference to the term "father-mother" in Eastern texts (re: SD 1.98 fn.)." It seemed like an easy task finding a father-mother reference, but - of course - proved to be not so easy.

In the Ṛg Veda we find "father and mother" used in a cosmological sense in many places, heaven as father and earth as mother. An (arbitrary) example can be found in [RV I, 185, 11](#) ([tr. Griffith 1896](#)):

idaṃ dyāvāpṛthivī satyamastu pitarmātaryadihopabruve vām |

bhūtaṃ devānāmavame avobhirvidyā... ||

"Be this my prayer fulfilled, O Earth and Heaven, wherewith, Father and Mother, I address you. Nearest of Gods be ye with your protection. May we find strengthening food in full abundance."

Historically the first sign of humans having a religious or symbolic perspective of the world is the idea of heaven and earth as the spiritual and material. This idea seems to date back even to Palaeolithic times. In the study of shamanistic beliefs it is a basic assumption.

The concept of a primordial unity of father-mother cf. SD 1, 98 fn, is of course quite a step beyond this. We do find this in later Hinduism, I think particularly in Śaivism, in the unification of Śiva and Parvati. Often a parallel is drawn between Śaivism and Vajrayāna Buddhism, regarding the imagery of Ādibuddha and his consort unified in "yab yum", which is the Tibetan word for "father-mother".

Problem is that this term for father-mother is generally not used in the Tibetan scriptures. I checked some of the Buddhist tantric texts, starting with the Guhyasamājatantra, but have not been able to find it. The terms corresponding to father and mother in this same sense are upāya and prajñā there. It is apparently being used though, in explanatory literature, for example in Mkhas grub rje's Rgyud sde spyi'i nram, translated by Lessing and Wayman, entitled Introduction to the Buddhist Tantric Systems, on page 304-305:

de man chad nang gi he ru ka yab yum dang rang gi rtsa ba'i bla ma dbyer med du mos par byas nas | [..]

"Subsequent to that, he convinces himself that the personal Heruka in "Father-Mother" union and his own basic guru are indissoluble; then takes initiation from him, [..]"

This is necessarily a very short summary of what could be said on this vast subject.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on December 11, 2011 at 12:02pm

Dharma-Dhatu (together with some of the vocabulary found in the SD) appears in B. Hodgson - Literature & Religion of the Buddhists (1841)

p.39 & 40 :

" The former of these (buddhas) are seven who are all characterised as " Manushi" or human ; the latter are five or six, and are contradistinguished as " Anupapadaka," without parents, and also as " Dhyani," or divine...

" The Dhyani Buddhas, with Adi Buddha, their chief, are usually and justly referred to the Theistic school. The epithet Dhyani, however, as applied to a class of Buddhas, is obviously capable of an atheistic interpretation. It is nevertheless certain, that, in whatever sense other schools may admit this term, or the class of Divinities which it characterises, the Aishwarikis (behond the bounds of Nepaul too) ascribe this creative Dhyani to a self-existent, infinite, and omniscient " Adi Buddha," one of whose attributes is the possession of five sorts of wisdom. Hence he is called " Panchajnyana Atmika ;" and it was by virtue of these five sorts of wisdom, that he, by five successive acts of Dhyani, created, from the beginning and for the duration of the present system of worlds, the " Pancha Buddha Dhyani." The names and graduation of these Jnyanas, Dhyans, and Buddhas are thus :

1. Suvisuddha Dharma Dhatu..."

It is equated with Vairochana Buddha

Also, in page 205, inside a foot note, the Dharma Dhatu is listed as one of the layer (the fourth) of a mandala.
But it is not referring to the one-element.

More interesting is Samuel Beal in his Catena, who wrote (p. 12) :

"Jiu-Ch'au calls his book " The Buddhist Kosmos, with illustrations." ^ The expression "Fah-kai^^ is a well-known one to signify the limits or elements of Dharma (dharma dhatu), where Dharma is the same as Prakriti, or Matter itself."

Dharma-dhatu prakriti appears also as title of one of the Prajna-paramita book (Volume II n° 7 - Chos-kyi-dvyings-kyi-rang-bjin-dvyer-med-par-bstan-pa) listed by Csoma de Körös in his Analysis of the Kanjur and Tanjur, translated in french by Léon Feer (Annales du Musée Guimet - Tome II).

And finally, closer to what we are looking for, on page 247, Csoma describe the Ratna-Kotni sutra (Rin-po-chehi-mthah) as a discussion between Buddha and Manjusri-Kumara-Bhuta on Dharma-Dhatu, called the first cause or prime root of all things.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on December 11, 2011 at 5:34pm

Anu/papa/daka = without papa/parent? Interesting, that anu means in old high German also without/non/not

But David Reigle has found out that is was a mistake by Monier-Williams and should rather trascribed

Aupapaduka: <http://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/ocglos/og-a.htm>

I cannot read Sanskrit so I am affright that our top theosophists (Blavatsky, Purucker, Barborka, Tyberg) or Judge (who writes Anupadaka in his Working Glossary) did not know it better, don't they? Or did they consider older Sanskrit texts which we do not know today?

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 12, 2011 at 5:35pm

Thank you, Ingmar, for the very helpful material on the question of "father-mother." This is good research. It gives us a good sample of what is out there. In the Vedic verse that you quoted, the terms father and mother, pitar mātār, are in the vocative case, "O father, O mother." As you say, "The concept of a primordial unity of father-mother cf. SD 1, 98 fn, is of course quite a step beyond this." We would have to find the terms father and mother together in a compound, pitṛ-matṛ, with the final member declined in some case other than the dual, so that it would not mean "father and mother." Then, the compound itself would have to be used in something like a cosmogonic context.

Certainly the idea of the unification of Śiva and Parvati found in Śaivism, or of an Ādibuddha and his consort unified in "yab yum" in Vajrayāna Buddhism, bring us closer. I, too, have found that yab yum for "father-mother" is not really used in the Indian Sanskrit texts, but seems to be a Tibetan usage. There in the Tibetan texts, I have so far not found it used like in the SD. But since only a fraction of the tantric texts have so far become available, there is still the possibility that it will be found in them. We have to keep searching.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 12, 2011 at 6:49pm

Thank you, Jacques, for continuing to search out the early sources for us. What you posted shows that the term dharma-dhātu was available in HPB's time. As you then say, "But it is not referring to the one-element."

The quote you gave in which Beal says "elements of Dharma (dharma dhatu), where Dharma is the same as Prakriti, or Matter itself," is based on Hodgson. Beal accepted Hodgson's incorrect understanding of the dharmas as being prakriti, or matter itself.

In the title of the Kanjur text, "Dharma-dhatu prakriti," prakriti is used in its normal sense of "nature" rather than as a Samkhya technical term meaning "matter." It is speaking of the indivisible nature of the dharma-dhātu.

Csoma de Körös worked independently of Hodgson, so was not influenced by Hodgson in the quote you gave where Csoma says "Dharma-Dhatu, called the first cause or prime root of all things." Twenty-two of the forty-nine sutras included in the Ratna-kuta-sutra were published in English translation in 1983 as: A Treasury of Mahāyāna sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūta sūtra. It would be worth checking these to see if they in fact anywhere call the dharma-dhātu the "first cause or prime root of all things," or whether this is just Csoma's interpretation. In general, I do not think Tibetans would be willing to call it this.

Returning to the eka-dhātu, the "one element," I do not know of any source on this term other than the single quotation in the Ratna-gotra-vibhaga, and then its source for it, the Anunatvapurnatvanirdesa. Even today this latter text is not published in English translation. That is why I think William Grosnick's article on the dhātu in the Anunatvapurnatvanirdesa, published in a hard-to-find publication, is so significant for us. Even in Dolpopa's Mountain Doctrine, which quotes the Ratna-gotra-vibhaga more than any other text, I do not recall seeing any mention of the "one element."

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 12, 2011 at 7:57pm

On anupadaka or anupapadaka, Frank, I agree that we must always consider the possibility of Sanskrit texts that we do not know today. In this particular case, however, the error could be traced, as described here on pp. 7-9:

<http://www.easterntertradition.org/book%20of%20dzryan%20research%20repo...>

Brian H. Hodgson was the first Westerner to gain access to the Sanskrit Buddhist texts, during his residency in Nepal where they were preserved. The incorrect anupapādaka appears in Hodgson's writings. From Hodgson it was copied in Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary, and from Hodgson it was earlier miscopied in Emil Schlagintweit's 1863 Buddhism in Tibet as anupadaka. From Schlagintweit, anupadaka was copied in The Secret Doctrine, along with other things. When Franklin Edgerton for his Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary went through the same Sanskrit Buddhist texts that Hodgson had used, he found only aupapādaka and upapādaka. Thus, I feel certain that the anupadaka in the SD is an error.

Strangely, I did come across the otherwise unknown word anupādaka in the Pranava-vada (vol. 3, pp. 118-122, of the English), but in a different meaning than used in the SD. So I still think the SD's anupadaka is an error for aupapādaka or upapādaka, since the meaning is the same.

Also, Frank, on Wednesday Ingmar had posted to the "New Stanzas of Dzryan Study Documents" this note and a link to the book: "Schmidt's 1835 Mongolisch-

Deutsch-Russisches Wörterbuch was pointed out to me by the late Henk Spienburg, in relation to the word chohan. I have not been checking this one out either." It would be good if you could check this for us sometime when you get a chance to. Perhaps you are already working on it. I know that these things take time.

Comment by [Jacques Mahnich](#) on December 13, 2011 at 4:59am

"A Treasury of Mahāyāna sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūta sūtra. It would be worth checking these to see if they in fact anywhere call the dharmadhātu the "first cause or prime root of all things," or whether this is just Csoma's interpretation"

Here are the first results of the check :

Chapter 12 - The Elucidation of Consciousness

p.226 : "Consciousness is devoid of form and substance, but it upholds all in the dharmadhātu."

p. 227 : "In the same way, from the same consciousness that upholds the entire dharmadhātu come all the samsaric beings with bodies of different colors, such as white, black, yellow, and red;..."

The power of memory is very strong in the dharmadhātu,..."

From the Notes (p.237) : "This sutra seems to be one of the forerunners or germinal source of the Mind-Only philosophy of the Yogachara School. The reader will find that the consciousness discussed here is in many ways similar to the Yogachara idea of the 'store consciousness' (alayavijnana)."

From the Glossary (p.474) : " Dharmadhātu : Literally, "the real of dharmas." However, in Buddhist texts it has four meanings :

1. The nature or essence of dharmas (the same as tathata), which is the unifying, underlying reality regarded as the ground of all things, both noumenal and phenomenal.
2. Infinity; the all-embracing totality of the infinite universes as revealed before the Buddha's eyes.
3. In certain sutras, denotes one of the eighteen elements : the dharma-element; that is the mental objects (dharmas).
4. The infinite universe per se.

The reader should bear in mind that 'dharmadhātu' may have any of the above four meanings.

From these sutra excerpts, dharmadhātu may be similar to alayavijnana. From the glossary (meaning 1 & 2), it is close to the one-element. We can safely say that it is not a Csoma' interpretation.

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on December 13, 2011 at 1:59pm

David, Schmidt's Mongolian-German-Russian dictionary has the term Chohan not in the index. I also checked phonetic variations as Tschohan/Tchohan/Schohan/Shohan. But it has at least the prefixes Cho and Chu on p. 159 column c, Chutuktu 174b, Chakravartin 186c, Lama 225c, primordial wisdom (Urweisheit) 105c, Gautama 202a.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on December 13, 2011 at 3:56pm

Some searches regards "Father-Mother". JC.

"Svabhâvat (Sk.). Explained by the Orientalists as "plastic substance", which is an inadequate definition. Svabhâvat is the world-substance and stuff, or rather that which is behind it—the spirit and essence of substance. The name comes from Subhâva and is composed of three words—su, good, perfect, fair, handsome; sva, self; and bkâva, being, or state of being. From it all nature proceeds and into it all returns at the end of the life-cycles. In Esotericism it is called "Father-Mother". It is the plastic essence of matter." Theosophical Glossary.

"Father-Mother (a compound word) of The Secret Doctrine." BCW XI p490.

"As it is said in the Ancient Teachings, "From the beginning, before Mother became Father-Mother - in Infinity the Fiery Dragon moved..." Helena Roerich Letters vol1 487.

"In the beginning, before Mother became Father-Mother, the fiery Dragon moved in the infinitudes alone" (Book of Sarpardjni.) The Aitareya Brahmana calls the Earth Sarparajni, "the Serpent Queen," and "the Mother of all that moves." SD1 74. Book of Sarpardjni, i, 103.

The Aitareya Brahmana ([Sanskrit](#): ऐतरेय ब्राह्मण) is the [Brahmana](#) of the Shakala [shakha](#) of the [Rigveda](#), an ancient Indian collection of sacred hymns. This work, according to the tradition is ascribed to Mahidasa Aitareya.[\[1\]](#) wikipedia.

The language of the Brahmanas is a separate stage of [Vedic Sanskrit](#), younger than the text of the samhitas (the [mantra](#) text of the Vedas proper) but for the most part older than the text of the [Sutras](#). It dates to 900- 700 BC. with some of the younger Brahmanas (such as the [Shatapatha Brahmana](#)) , dating to about the 6th century BC.[\[3\]](#) wikipedia.

[Aitareya Brahmana](#), rarely also known as Ashvalayana Brahmana (AB)[\[4\]](#)

^ Theodor Aufrecht, Das Aitareya Braahmana. Mit Auszügen aus dem Commentare von Sayanacarya und anderen Beilagen, Bonn 1879; [TITUS etext](#)

No matching entry for Sarpardjni, 14867 found in TITUS text database

"The \World-Soul, that which is called by the Esoteric Yogacharyas "Father-Mother,""

Xenocrates referred to as a male-female Principle, the male element of which, the Father, he designated as the last Zeus, the last dhine activity, just as the students of the Secret Doctrine designate it the third and last Logos, Brahma or Mahat." Lucifer X

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 14, 2011 at 6:03am

Jeremy: on SD 1, 74, In the beginning, before Mother became Father-Mother, the fiery Dragon moved in the infinitudes alone" (Book of Sarpardjni.) The Aitareya Brahmana calls the Earth Sarparajni, "the Serpent Queen," and "the Mother of all that moves. Book of Sarpardjni, i, 103.

Sarparājñī appears twice in Aitareya-Brahmana, in [AB, 5, 23, 1](#) and [AB, 5, 23, 2](#). The "Book of Sarpardjni" could be the verses of the Rg Veda attributed to Sarparājñī, [RV X, 189](#) and Taittirīya Saṃhitā I, 5, 4 cf. Monier-Williams p. 1184, "sarparājñī". The reference to i, 103 would be unclear though

RV X, 189:

āyaṃ ghauḥ pṛśnirakramīdasadan mātaraṃ puraḥ |
pitaraṃ ca prayan svaḥ ||
antaścarati rocanāsya prāṇādapānatī |
vyakhyanmahiṣo divam ||
triṃśad dhāma vi rājati vāk pataraṃghāya dhīyate |
prativastoraha dyubhiḥ ||

tr. of [Griffith](#):

1. THIS spotted Bull hath come, and sat before the Mother in the east,
Advancing to his Father heaven.
- 2 Expiring when he draws his breath, she moves along the lucid spheres:
The Bull shines out through all the sky.
- 3 Song is bestowed upon the Bird: it rules supreme through thirty realms
Throughout the days at break of morn.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on December 14, 2011 at 8:27am

The dharma-dhātu question is important, and I will return to it shortly.

Thank you, Frank, for checking Schmidt's Mongolian-German-Russian dictionary for the term Chohan. I wonder what Henk Spierenburg meant.

A few quick notes on Sarpa-rajni. The spelling Sarparajni is found in the SD, with an accent mark on the last "a". The spelling Sarpardjni is only a machine misreading of this, where the OCR program read the "a" with accent as "d". The reference to "i, 103" is to the 1893 third edition of the SD, taken from its 1895 index volume. HPB speaks more fully of Sarparajni in Collected Writings vol. 1. There is no known "Book of Sarparajni." As Ingmar suggested, it possibly refers to Rig-veda 10.189, the only Vedic hymn that is attributed to Sarparajni. But there is little in this short hymn. Nor does its use in the sacrifice, described in the Aitareya Brahmana, add a lot. Even there, HPB quotes Martin Haug's 1863 translation as saying "the Mother of all that moves" (SD 1.74). In fact, his translation says "the queen of all that moves (sarpat)" (pp. 358-359, 1922 reprint p. 244). The word rājñī means "queen" rather than "mother." Also, Arthur Berriedale Keith's 1920 translation gives this phrase as: "the queen of what creeps" (Rigveda Brahmanas, p. 248). The verb sarpat, "creeps," goes with the noun sarpa, "serpent." For "all that moves," we normally find words coming from the Sanskrit roots "cal" and "car."

Comment by [Frank Reitemeyer](#) on December 14, 2011 at 10:21am

>Thank you, Frank, for checking Schmidt's Mongolian-German-Russian dictionary for the term Chohan. I wonder what Henk Spierenburg meant.

I had only time for quick reading and checking the index for all possible variations. To be sure I'll need to read this big book line by line to be sure that Chohan is not there.

This will take some time as I am writings on some other theosophical articles, too. I come back to it and all teh other home work you gave me...:-)

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on December 14, 2011 at 1:52pm

Thanks for that Igmar, for your valuable inclusions and links.

David, HPB mentions the 'serpent queen' as well as the 'mother of all that moves'. Thanks for your thoughts on the additional reference. Queen and Mother

seem to be used interchangeably in some texts even if this is not technically correct to do so. The feminine is though noted.

"In the beginning, before Mother became Father-Mother, the fiery Dragon moved in the infinitudes alone" (Book of Sarpardjni.) The Aitareya Brahmana calls the Earth Sarparajni, "the Serpent Queen," and "the Mother of all that moves." SD1 74. Book of Sarpardjni, i, 103.

Also I had no time to include other sources. So here they are with a further mention of Father-Mother. Here we might note the divine mother, father life and the living Son.

"Bardesanes or Bardaisan. A Syrian Gnostic, erroneously regarded as a Christian theologian, born at Edessa (Edessene Chronicle) in 155 of our era (Assemani Bibl.. Orient. i. 389). He was a great astrologer following the Eastern Occult System. According to Porphyry (who calls him the Babylonian, probably on account of his Chaldeeism or astrology), "Bardesanes . . . held intercourse with the Indians that had been sent to the Cæsar with Damadamis at their head" (De Abst. iv. 17), and had his information from the Indian gymnosophists. The fact is that most of his teachings, however much they may have been altered by his numerous Gnostic followers, can be traced to Indian philosophy, and still more to the Occult teachings of the Secret System. Thus in his Hymns he speaks of the creative Deity as "Father-Mother" Theosophical Glossary.

Fragments of a Faith Forgotten

, by G.R.S. Mead, [1900], at sacred-texts.com

Ephraim. The first three are as follows, in Hort's B translation: From his Hymns.

(1) "Thou fountain of joy
Whose gate by commandment
Opens wide to the Mother;
Which Beings divine
Have measured and founded,
Which Father and Mother
In their union have sown,
With their steps have made fruitful."

(2) "Let her who comes after thee
To me be a daughter
A sister to thee."

(3) "When at length shall it be ours
To look on thy banquet,
To see the young maiden,
The daughter thou sett'st
On thy knee and caressest?"

The Hymn of the Soul.

The high probability of the Bardesantist origin of the poem is based on the following considerations: The three main accusations of the orthodox Father Ephraim against Bardaisan, who, he says, taught that there were Seven Essences (lthyē), are: "(1) That

p. 404

he denied the resurrection and regarded the separation of the soul from the body as a blessing; (2) that he held the theory of a divine 'Mother' who in conjunction with 'the Father of Life' gave birth to a being called 'the Son of the Living'; (3)

that he believed in a number of lesser 'gods,' that is to say, eternal beings subordinate to the supreme God.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on December 14, 2011 at 2:08pm

"The World-Soul, that which is called by the Esoteric Yogacharyas "Father-Mother,"

Xenocrates referred to as a male-female Principle, the male element of which, the Father, he designated as the last Zeus, the last divine activity, just as the students of the Secret Doctrine designate it the third and last Logos, Brahma or Mahat." Lucifer X 456.

Xenocrates (Ξενοκράτης; c. 396/5 – 314/3 BC[1]) of Chalcedon was a Greek philosopher, mathematician, and leader (scholarch) of the Platonic Academy from 339/8 to 314/3 BC. His teachings followed those of Plato, which he attempted to define more closely, often with mathematical elements. He distinguished three forms of being, the sensible, the intelligible, and a third compounded of the two, to which correspond respectively, sense, intellect and opinion. Unity and duality he considered to be gods which rule the universe, and the soul is a self-moving number. God pervades all things, and there are daemonical powers, intermediate between the divine and the mortal, which consist in conditions of the soul.

Probably we should connect with this the statement that Xenocrates called unity and duality (monas and duos) deities, and characterised the former as the first male existence, ruling in heaven, as father and Zeus, as uneven number and spirit; the latter as female, as the mother of the gods, and as the soul of the universe which reigns over the mutable world under heaven. wikipedia.

Comment by [Jeremy Condick](#) on December 14, 2011 at 2:20pm

"We read in Matthew 16:15-16: "Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God."

re Bardesanes, further to the 'Son of the Living' in reference to the soul as birthed from spirit matter, father-mother I thought to include the above ref to Christ the 'son of the living god'.

"The true clothing of the soul, according to the poet, is the ideal form which it feet behind in heaven and will resume after death. [Only after the 'death unto sin'; the Light-robe is not for all.] As for the Father of Life, the Mother, and the Son of the Living, they here figure as the Father 'the King of

p. 405

kings,' the Mother 'the Queen of the East,' and the Brother 'the next in rank.' Finally the 'lesser gods' appear as 'the kings,' who obey the command of the King of kings." Fragments of a Faith Forgotten, by G.R.S. Mead, [1900], at sacred-texts.com

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 14, 2011 at 5:17pm

Regarding chohan, two Mongolian words are especially interesting 1. хан (khan) and 2. хаган (xagan), both derived from an older Mongolian word "qayan". Both are titles of Mongolian rulers. In Turkish 2. is styled hakan.

Comment by [John Coven](#) on December 14, 2011 at 6:34pm

Chohan/Chowhan/Chauhan/Chouhan (Hindi: चौहान), (Urdu: چوان) (Gujarati: ચૌહાણ), (Punjabi: ਚੌਹਾਨ) is a Rajput clan name (Kshatriya too, I think). Chauhan is mostly spelled Chowhan in Bangladesh. Chauhan decedents also use the surname spelling, Chohan.

Comment by [Ingmar de Boer](#) on December 15, 2011 at 1:44am

Checked the passage on the bald Sarparājñī in [CW I, 226-227](#), the 1863 translation of AB by Martin Haug, and also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. No trace of the "Book of Sarparajni" or the quotation on Father-Mother.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on Friday

Thank you, John, for letting us know about the widespread use of the word "Chohan" as a surname in northern India and contiguous areas. This is useful to know in our search here. It so happens that Doss McDavid had come across this while searching a while back, and had let me know about it. We then concluded that it probably is not the word "Chohan" as used in the Mahatma letters, which appears to be a title.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) on Friday

Thank you, Jacques, for finding and posting the references to the dharma-dhātu in the sūtra from the Ratnakūṭa collection that was given the English title, "The Elucidation of Consciousness." This sūtra is quite unusual in Buddhism in what it says about consciousness. Nonetheless, its references to the dharma-dhātu are standard enough. Its Sanskrit title is Bhadrāpāla-śreṣṭhi-paripṛcchā, "The Questions of the Merchant Leader Bhadrāpāla." It so far remains lost in the original Sanskrit, and we have only its Chinese and Tibetan translations. For those who don't have the book, A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras, the sūtras in it were translated from Chinese.

From these quotes, "all in the dharmadhatu," and "the entire dharmadhatu," we see that the dharma-dhātu stands for everything in the universe. As there said, it can be (and often is), translated as "the realm of dharmas," taking dhātu in its meaning of "realm" rather than "element." Regarding the first meaning of dharma-dhātu quoted from the glossary of this 1983 book of translations from Chinese: "The nature or essence of dharmas (the same as tathata), which is the unifying, underlying reality regarded as the ground of all things, both noumenal and phenomenal." This is close to what Csoma de Körös gave long ago, the "first cause or prime root of all things." But there are differences that most Tibetan Buddhists would not accept.

While most Tibetan Buddhists would be willing to call the dharma-dhātu the "ground of all things," they would not likely be willing to call it "the first cause." Even calling it "the prime root of all things" would be acceptable only to some. For the majority of Tibetan Buddhists, the dharma-dhātu is equivalent to emptiness, śūnyatā. Emptiness is indeed "the unifying, underlying reality regarded as the ground of all things" in one sense, in that everything shares the nature of being empty. This is their unifying and underlying reality. But

emptiness, for most Tibetan Buddhists, is not a ground of all things like "the first cause," from which the universe can arise. Therefore, for them, it is not "the prime root of all things." For the minority of Tibetan Buddhists who accept the Shentong or "empty of other" teachings, accepting an emptiness that is empty of everything other than itself, the dharma-dhātu as "the prime root of all things" is more acceptable.

Comment by [John Coven](#) on Saturday

Yes, David, I have considered as much, but as historians hold the theory that these tribes entered India and defeated the original Kshatriyas, I thought it would not be fully irrelevant to look for the origin of the Hindu name, Chohan, in an ancient term elsewhere, and in that respect, the various Indian spellings could prove helpful.

The meaning of Chohan, as the north Indian variant of the Rajput and Sikh name Chauhan, seems to have been lost, but it is a name of great and ancient prestige. There is, however, a legend that the ancestor of this Rajput clan emerged from a sacrificial fire with four arms, so Chauhan became associated with the Sanskrit word, chatur – meaning 'four' – but this goes as folk etymology goes.

As you stated, nothing of the surname Chohan may bear any relation to the (Theosophical) title, Chohan (Lord), as Chohan is also spelled, Cho-Khan, and can mean 'Dharma-Lord' if cho derives from the Tibetan chös (pronounced chō), meaning dharma/suchness. In my notes, I find that the Tibetan chos-mkan (pronounced chě-kěn or chō-kěn) means 'one who practices or is skilled in the dharma', and I hope you have more to say about that.

Also, the Tibetan word jo-bo is pronounced chō, and means, 'the elder brother', or 'Lord', 'Master', and in ancient time used for certain divine persons and idols. (A Tibetan-English Dictionary, H. A. Jaschke)

Cho-Khan or cho-han could be a Tibetan-Mongolian compound: The Mongolian (but originally, Altaic) word khanis pronounced hahn, and all over the Central Asia it means 'lord, commander, ruler, emperor or king,' which would make the compound, Cho-Khan (or Cho-Han), signify a Dharma-Lord, a Master of Suchness.

By the way, thanks to you all for the most interesting discussion on Internet about the origin of the Secret Doctrine. I have been appreciating your knowledge for some while – it has taken hours to read it through.

Comment by [John Coven](#) on Saturday

When I wrote "in ancient times for certain divine persons, and idols", this was for the honorary title, o-jo min-po, for noblemen and priests (and in West for noble Mussulmans); not jo-bo, which is as correctly stated, a Lord or Master.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) yesterday

Very interesting further material on the name Chauhan/Chohan, John. This possible connection should certainly be considered. Regarding the conclusion I posted, that it probably is not the word "Chohan" as used in the

Mahatma letters, I should have spoken only for myself. I am not sure if this conclusion is shared by Doss McDavid.

If we regard the word as being Tibetan, then the once occurring spelling Cho-khan gives us some possibilities, while the usual spelling Chohan offers little. As we have seen, the problems in transcribing the handwriting of the some of the Mahatma letters are great. It would be quite easy to read an "h" for a "k," or even a "kh."

The hypothesis that Cho-khan is the word "chos mkhan" seems likely to me. The word spelled "mkhan po" is what is used for the abbot of a monastery. So, as pronounced, "Khenpo" refers to an abbot, who may also more honorifically be called "Khen Rinpoche." The word chos (pronounced with silent "s"), as most of you know, means "dharma," and this is what is used for the Buddhist teachings. So a "Dharma abbot" would make sense for chos mkhan. Also, as you mentioned, the word mkhan as the second member of a two-part word means 'one who practices or is skilled in' something. Thus, rtsis means astrology and rtsis mkhan is an astrologer. So "one who is skilled in the Dharma" would also make sense for chos mkhan. The problem with both of these is that chos mkhan has not been found in use, and the Tibetans I asked about this had not heard of such a use.

Regarding jo bo, lord or master, this word as a title is often used to refer to the Indian teacher Atisha, who came to Tibet. I think that Rich Taylor had suggested the jo of jo bo for the cho of chohan. Although Tibetan is pronounced differently from one region to another, I have not heard of this jo being pronounced as cho.

Comment by [David Reigle](#) yesterday

Further on the dharma-dhātu. This compound term is found in many Buddhist texts, and has a range of meanings. It has been translated as "sphere of religion," "element of the Law," "sphere of phenomena," "element of attributes," "sphere of reality," "expanse of reality," "basic space of reality," "basic space of phenomena," "ultimate expanse," "ultimate realm," etc. The dharma-dhātu and the dhātu, the "element," are synonyms, as may be seen, for example, in Ratnagotra-vibhāga 2.38-39. Nonetheless, they are not full synonyms. A turning wheel is still a wheel, but not all wheels are turning. The term dharma-dhātu is relatively common, while the term dhātu, used in this meaning, is relatively uncommon.

In the majority of the occurrences of the stock phrase found in Buddhist texts about whether the Tathāgatas arise or whether they do not arise, the term dhātu by itself is used. In a minority of occurrences, the term dharma-dhātu is used. Therefore in the parallel phrase from the esoteric Senzar Catechism, I think that just the term dhātu is used (translated as "Space"), and not dharma-dhātu. While the term dharma-dhātu was known in HPB's time, as shown in quotations provided by Jacques, the term dhātu (used in this meaning) may not have been known in HPB's time.

When we do find just the term dhātu in Buddhist texts, used in this meaning, it may be prefixed by certain adjectives. These are acintya, "inconceivable" or "unthinkable," nirabhilapya, "inexpressible" or "unspeakable," alakṣaṇa, "without defining characteristics" or "unmarked" (Conze), anāsrava, "immaculate" or "uncontaminated" or "without outflows" (Conze), and perhaps a few more. To get an idea of how frequent these are, we may look at Edward Conze's translation of The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom. This is a composite translation of sections of the Prajñā-pāramitā Sūtra in 25,000 lines and in 18,000 lines, with occasional

sections from that in 100,000 lines. The English translation occupies more than 600 pages.

The term dharma-dhātu, translated as "Dharma-element," occurs there more than 50 times. The term acintya-dhātu, translated as "unthinkable element," occurs there about 14 times (pp. 123, 179, 183, 185, 188, 193, 249, 253, 277, 305, 370, 374, 376, 377). The term nirabhilāpya-dhātu, translated as "inexpressible realm," occurs there about 11 times (pp. 646-647). The term alakṣaṇa-dhātu, translated as "unmarked element," occurs there about 1 time (p. 544), and in a similar phrase translated as "markless element" (p. 353). The term anāsrava-dhātu does not seem to occur in The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, but it is found in Vasubandhu's commentary on Mahāyāna-Sūtrālaṃkāra, chapter 9, verse 23, and in the Ratna-gotra-vibhāga, chapter 1, verse 85.

This gives us a perspective on the term eka-dhātu, the "one element." It does not seem to occur in The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, but it is found 1 time in Asaṅga's commentary on the Ratna-gotra-vibhāga (chapter 1, verse 12). As we know, the dhātu is a central topic of this unique text. For comparison, the term dhātu occurs there more than 170 times. The sole occurrence of eka-dhātu is therefore quite unusual. Tracing the dhātu teaching back to its stated source in the Anūnatvāpūrṇatva-nirdeśa-parivarta, lost in Sanskrit, never translated into Tibetan, extant only in Chinese translation, and not yet published in English translation, with the help of a little-known article by William Grosnick we found that the term eka-dhātu plays a large role in this small text. In the Theosophical writings, the "one element" is the usual form used. This, I believe, is significant. The use of the term dharma-dhātu is not uncommon in Buddhist texts. The use of the term dhātu in this meaning is uncommon. The use of th

Comment by [David Reigle](#) yesterday

repeating and completing my last paragraph, that got cut off:

This gives us a perspective on the term eka-dhātu, the "one element." It does not seem to occur in The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, but it is found 1 time in Asaṅga's commentary on the Ratna-gotra-vibhāga (chapter 1, verse 12). As we know, the dhātu is a central topic of this unique text. For comparison, the term dhātu occurs there more than 170 times. The sole occurrence of eka-dhātu is therefore quite unusual. Tracing the dhātu teaching back to its stated source in the Anūnatvāpūrṇatva-nirdeśa-parivarta, lost in Sanskrit, never translated into Tibetan, extant only in Chinese translation, and not yet published in English translation, with the help of a little-known article by William Grosnick we found that the term eka-dhātu plays a large role in this small text. In the Theosophical writings, the "one element" is the usual form used. This, I believe, is significant. The use of the term dharma-dhātu is not uncommon in Buddhist texts. The use of the term dhātu in this meaning is uncommon. The use of the term eka-dhātu is extremely uncommon. Yet it is there, in the very source of the teaching on the dhātu.

