

PLANETARY SYMBOLISM

Articles by H. P. Blavatsky

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

THE HISTORY OF A PLANET

STAR-ANGEL-WORSHIP

IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

STARS AND NUMBERS

H. P. BLAVATSKY SERIES • NO. 21
THEOSOPHY COMPANY (MYSORE) PRIVATE LTD.
BANGALORE 560004

FOREWORD

IN the Preface to *Isis Unveiled*, her first published work (1877), H. P. Blavatsky gave as one of her purposes “a restitution of borrowed robes and the vindication of calumniated but glorious reputations.” Ten years later, when she began publishing *Lucifer* in England (September, 1887), her opening editorial discussion of the name of this Theosophical magazine was quite evidently a continuation of that purpose. Lucifer, the Light-Bringer, the Morning Star, had been given a bad name by medieval Christian theology, and as H.P.B. explained in her editorial, “What’s in a Name?”, the fear that prejudice might prevent some people from reading a magazine titled *Lucifer* was not a reason for changing its name. On the contrary, the magazine was founded to correct just such misconceptions.

“What’s in a Name?” is the statement of an editorial position and policy. In the same—September, 1887—issue of *Lucifer* she published another article, “The History of a Planet,” which provides a clear light on how the ancients regarded the planet Venus, or Lucifer. Called because of its radiance a second sun by Pythagoras, Venus was assigned divine qualities by the Greeks and the Romans, while the Egyptians identified the planet with Isis and made the *crux ansata*, or *ankh*, its symbol. The association of Lucifer-Venus with Satan was part of the general process by which all the Greco-Aryan gods were transformed into “semitic devils,” through theological inventions to uphold superstition. In this article H.P.B. shows that “Lucifer-Venus is a *sacred* planet, and no synonym of Satan “

The editorial note introducing “Star-Angel-Worship in the Roman Catholic Church,” which appeared in *Lucifer* for July, 1888, has particular importance. The reason for exposing the curious bit of

religious history with which this article deals, H.P.B. explains, is the charge by Roman Catholics that Theosophists “worship” planetary spirits and star angels. After pointing out that Theosophists recognize the existence of such high beings, but do not worship them, although holding them in reverence, she shows that Roman Catholicism has in some of its branches practiced a veritable polytheism, and, while little known, the worship of Star-Angels in the Catholic Church had not in fact been abolished. After all, the Virgin Mary, she points out, is “a regular *goddess*.” Those who are led to wonder about the Theosophical teaching in relation to these matters would do well to turn to *The Secret Doctrine*, a work in which the part played in universal evolution by planetary spirits and Dhyanic Intelligences called “Star-Angels” by theological writers is dealt with in detail. Much is explained about Venus, also, in that work.

“Stars and Numbers,” a consideration of the implications of Astrology, was published by H.P.B. in the *Theosophist* for June, 1881. In this article she shows the universal respect for the science of astrology of ancient thinkers, and gives examples of extraordinary planetary conjunctions which marked grave historical events. The article concludes with some illustrations of Kabalistic reckoning, and finally the suggestion that those who believe in another world besides the visible one, and in non-material forces, can hardly ignore the reality of an occult science of number.

Lucifer, September, 1887

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

WHY THE MAGAZINE IS CALLED “LUCIFER”

WHAT'S in a name? Very often there is more in it than the profane is prepared to understand, or the learned mystic to explain. It is an invisible, secret, but very potential influence that every name carries about with it and “leaveth wherever it goeth.” Carlyle thought that “there is much, nay, almost all, in names.” “Could I unfold the influence of names, which are the most important of all clothings, I were a second great Trismegistus,” he writes.

The name or title of a magazine started with a definite object, is, therefore, all important; for it is, indeed, the invisible seed-grain, which will either grow “to be an all-over-shadowing tree” on the fruits of which must depend the nature of the results brought about by the said object, or the tree will wither and die. These considerations show that the name of the present magazine—rather equivocal to orthodox Christian ears—is due to no careless selection, but arose in consequence of much thinking over its fitness, and was adopted as the best symbol to express that object and the results in view.

Now, the first and most important, if not the sole object of the magazine, is expressed in the line from the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, on its title page. It is to bring light to “the hidden things of darkness,” (iv. 5); to show in their true aspect and their original real meaning things and names, men and their doings and customs; it is finally to fight prejudice, hypocrisy and shams in every nation, in every class of Society, as in every department of life. The task is a laborious one but it is neither impracticable nor useless, if even as an experiment.

Thus, for an attempt of such nature, no better title could ever be

found than the one chosen. “Lucifer,” is the pale morning-star, the precursor of the full blaze of the noon-day sun—the “Eos-phoros” of the Greeks. It shines timidly at dawn to gather forces and dazzle the eye after sunset as its own brother “Hesperos”—the radiant evening star, or the planet Venus. No fitter symbol exists for the proposed work—that of throwing a ray of truth on everything hidden by the darkness of prejudice, by social or religious misconceptions; especially by that idiotic routine in life, which, once that a certain action, a thing, a name, has been branded by slanderous inventions, however unjust, makes *respectable* people, so called, turn away shiveringly, refusing to even look at it from any other aspect than the one sanctioned by public opinion. Such an endeavour then, to force the weak-hearted to look truth straight in the face, is helped most efficaciously by a title belonging to the category of branded names.

Piously inclined readers may argue that “Lucifer” is accepted by all the churches as one of the many names of the Devil. According to Milton’s superb fiction, Lucifer is *Satan*, the “rebellious” angel, the enemy of God and man. If one analyzes his rebellion, however, it will be found of no worse nature than an assertion of free-will and independent thought, as if Lucifer had been born in the XIXth century. This epithet of “rebellious” is a theological calumny, on a par with that other slander of God by the Predestinarians, one that makes of deity an “Almighty” fiend worse than the “rebellious” Spirit himself; “an omnipotent Devil desiring to be ‘complimented’ as all merciful when he is exerting the most fiendish cruelty,” as put by J. Cotter Morison. Both the foreordaining and predestining fiend-God, and his subordinate agent are of human invention; they are two of the most morally repulsive and horrible theological dogmas that the nightmares of light-hating monks have ever evolved out of their unclean fancies.

They date from the Mediaeval age, the period of mental obscurantism, during which most of the present prejudices and superstitions have been forcibly inoculated on the human mind, so as to have become nearly ineradicable in some cases, one of which is the present prejudice now under discussion.

So deeply rooted, indeed, is this preconception and aversion to the

name of Lucifer—meaning no worse than “light-bringer” (from *lux*, *lucis*, “light,” and *ferre* “to bring”)¹—even among the educated classes, that by adopting it for the title of their magazine the editors have the prospect of a long strife with public prejudice before them. So absurd and ridiculous is that prejudice, indeed, that no one has seemed to ever ask himself the question, how came Satan to be called a *light-bringer*, unless the silvery rays of the morning-star can in any way be made suggestive of the glare of the infernal flames. It is simply, as Henderson showed, “one of those gross perversions of sacred writ which so extensively obtain, and which are to be traced to a proneness to seek for more in a given passage than it really contains—a disposition to be influenced by sound rather than sense, and an implicit faith in received interpretation”—which is not quite one of the weaknesses of our present age. Nevertheless, the prejudice is there, to the shame of our century.

This cannot be helped. The two editors would hold themselves as recreants in their own sight, as traitors to the very spirit of the proposed work, were they to yield and cry craven before the danger. If one would fight prejudice, and brush off the ugly cobwebs of superstition and materialism alike from the noblest ideals of our forefathers, one has to prepare for opposition. “The crown of the reformer and the innovator is a crown of thorns” indeed. If one would rescue Truth in all her chaste nudity from the almost bottomless well, into which she has been hurled by cant and hypocritical propriety, one should not hesitate to descend into the dark, gaping pit of that well. No matter how badly the blind bats—the dwellers in darkness, and the haters of light—may treat in their gloomy abode the intruder, unless one is the first to show the spirit and courage he preaches to others, he must be justly held as a hypocrite and a seceder from his own principles.

Hardly had the title been agreed upon, when the first premonitions of what was in store for us, in the matter of the opposition to be encountered owing to the title chosen, appeared on our horizon. One of the editors received and recorded some spicy objections. The scenes

¹ “It was Gregory the Great who was the first to apply this passage of Isaiah ‘How art thou fallen from Heaven, Lucifer, son of the morning,’ etc., to Satan, and ever since the bold metaphor of the prophet, which referred, after all but to an Assyrian king inimical to the Israelites, has been applied to the Devil!”

that follow are sketches from nature.

I

A Well-known Novelist. Tell me about your new magazine. What class do you propose to appeal to?

Editor. No class in particular: we intend to appeal to the public.

Novelist. I am very glad of that. For once I shall be one of

the public, for I don't understand your subject in the least, and I want to. But you must remember that if your public is to understand you, it must necessarily be a very small one. People talk about occultism nowadays as they talk about many other things, without the least idea of what it means. We are so ignorant and—so prejudiced.

Editor. Exactly. That is what calls the new magazine into existence. We propose to educate you. and to tear the mask from every prejudice.

Novelist. That really is good news to me, for I want to be educated. What is your magazine to be called?

Editor. Lucifer.

Novelist. What! Are you going to educate us in vice? We know enough about that. Fallen angels are plentiful. You may find popularity, for soiled doves are in fashion just now, while the white-winged angels are voted a bore, because they are not so amusing. But I doubt your being able to teach us much.

II

A Man of the World (in a careful undertone, for the scene is a dinner-party). I hear you are going to start a magazine, all about occultism. Do you know, I'm very glad. I don't say anything about such matters as a rule, but some queer things have happened in my life which can't be explained in any ordinary manner. I hope you will go in for explanations.

Editor. We shall try, certainly. My impression is, that when occultism is in any measure apprehended, its laws are accepted by everyone as the only intelligible explanation of life.

A M. W. Just so, I want to know all about it, for 'pon my honour, life's a mystery. There are plenty of other people as curious as myself. This is an age which is afflicted with the Yankee disease of "wanting to know." I'll get you lots of subscribers. What's the magazine called?

Editor. Lucifer—and (*warned by former experience*) don't misunderstand the name. It is typical of the divine spirit which sacrificed itself for humanity—it was Milton's doing that it ever became associated with the devil. We are sworn enemies to popular prejudices, and it is quite appropriate that we should attack such a prejudice as this—Lucifer, you

know, is the Morning Star—the Lightbearer,

A M. W. (interrupting). Oh, I know all that—at least I don't know, but I take it for granted you've got some good reason for taking such a title. But your first object is to have readers; you want the public to buy your magazine, I suppose. That's in the programme, isn't it?

Editor. Most decidedly.

A M. W. Well, listen to the advice of a man who knows his way about town. Don't mark your magazine with the wrong colour at starting. It's quite evident, when one stays an instant to think of its derivation and meaning, that Lucifer is an excellent word. But the public don't stay to think of derivations and meanings; and the first impression is the most important. Nobody will buy the magazine if you call it Lucifer.

III

A Fashionable Lady Interested in Occultism. I want to hear some more about the new magazine, for I have interested a great many people in it, even with the little you have told me. But I find it difficult to express its actual purpose. What is it?

Editor. To try and give a little light to those that want it.

A F. L. Well, that's a simple way of putting it, and will be very useful to me. What is the magazine to be called?

Editor. Lucifer.

A F. L. (After a pause) You can't mean it.

Editor. Why not?

A F. L. The associations are so dreadful! What can be the object of calling it that? It sounds like some unfortunate sort of joke, made against it by its enemies.

Editor. Oh, but Lucifer, you know, means Light-bearer; it is typical of the Divine Spirit—

A F. L. Never mind all that—I want to do your magazine good and make it known, and you can't expect me to enter into explanations of that sort every time I mention the title? Impossible! Life is too short and too busy. Besides, it would produce such a bad effect; people would think me priggish, and then I couldn't talk at all, for I couldn't bear them to think that. Don't call it Lucifer—please don't. Nobody knows what the word is typical of; what it means now is the devil, nothing more or less.

Editor. But then that is quite a mistake, and one of the first prejudices we propose to do battle with. Lucifer is the pale, pure herald of dawn—

Lady (interrupting). I thought you were going to do something more interesting and more important than to whitewash mythological characters.

We shall all have to go to school again, or read up Dr. Smith's Classical Dictionary. And what is the use of it when it is done? I thought you were going to tell us things about our own lives and how to make them better. I suppose Milton wrote about Lucifer, didn't he?—but nobody reads Milton now. Do let us have a modern title with some human meaning in it.

IV

A Journalist (thoughtfully, while rolling his cigarette). Yes, it is a good idea, this magazine of yours. We shall all laugh at it, as a matter of course: and we shall cut it up in the papers. But we shall all read it, because secretly everybody hungers after the mysterious. What are you going to call it?

Editor. Lucifer.

Journalist (striking a light). Why not *The Fusee*? Quite as good a title and not so pretentious.

The "Novelist," the "Man of the World," the "Fashionable Lady," and the "Journalist," should be the first to receive a little instruction. A glimpse into the real and primitive character of Lucifer can do them no harm and may, perchance, cure them of a bit of ridiculous prejudice. They ought to study their Homer and Hesiod's Theogony if they would do justice to Lucifer, "*Eosphoros and Hesperos*," the Morning and the Evening beautiful star. If there are more useful things to do in this life than "to whitewash mythological characters," to slander and blacken them is, at least, as useless, and shows, moreover, a narrow-mindedness which can do honour to no one.

To object to the title of LUCIFER, only because its "associations are so dreadful," is pardonable—if it can be pardonable in any case—only in an ignorant American missionary of some dissenting sect, in one whose natural laziness and lack of education led him to prefer ploughing the minds of heathens, as ignorant as he is himself, to the more profitable, but rather more arduous, process of ploughing the fields of his own father's farm. In the English clergy, however, who receive all a more or less classical education, and are, therefore, supposed to be acquainted with the *ins* and *outs* of theological sophistry and casuistry, this kind of opposition is absolutely unpardonable. It not only smacks of hypocrisy and deceit, but places them directly on a lower moral level than him they call the apostate angel. By endeavouring to show the theological Lucifer, fallen through the idea that

To reign is worth ambition, though in Hell;
Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven,

they are virtually putting into practice the supposed crime they would fain accuse him of. They prefer reigning over the spirit of the masses by means of a pernicious dark LIE, productive of many an evil, than serve heaven by serving TRUTH. Such practices are worthy only of the Jesuits,

But their sacred writ is the first to contradict their interpretations and the association of Lucifer, the Morning Star, with Satan. Chapter XXII of *Revelation*, verse 16th, says: "I, Jesus ... am the root. . . and the bright and *Morning Star*" (*oPQPivos* "early rising"): hence Eosphoros, or the Latin Lucifer. The opprobrium attached to this name is of such a very late date, that the Roman Church found itself forced to screen the theological slander behind a two-sided interpretation—as usual. Christ, we are told, is the "Morning Star," the *divine* Lucifer; and Satan the *usurpator* of the *Verbum*, the "infernal Lucifer."² "The great Archangel Michael, the conqueror of Satan, is identical in paganism³ with Mercury-Mithra, to whom, after defending the Sun (symbolical of God) from the attacks of Venus-Lucifer, was given the possession of this planet, *et, datus est ei locus Luciferi*. And since the Archangel Michael is the 'Angel of the Face,' and 'the Vicar of the *Verbum*'⁹ he is now considered in the Roman Church as the regent of that planet Venus which 'the vanquished fiend had usurped'." *Angelus faciei Dei sedem superbi humilis obtinuit*, says Cornelius a Lapide (in Vol. VI, p. 229).

This gives the reason why one of the early Popes was called Lucifer, as Yonge and ecclesiastical records prove. It thus follows that the title chosen for our magazine is as much associated with divine and pious ideas as with the supposed rebellion of the hero of Milton's "Paradise Lost." By choosing it, *we throw the first ray of light and truth* on a ridiculous prejudice which ought to have no room made for it in this our "age of facts and discovery." We work for true Religion

² Mirville's *Memoirs to the Academy of France*, Vol. IV, quoting Cardinal Ventura.

³ Which paganism has passed long millenniums, it would seem, in copying beforehand Christian dogmas to come.

and Science, in the interest of fact as against fiction and prejudice. It is our duty, as it is that of physical Science—professedly its mission—to throw light on facts in Nature hitherto surrounded by the darkness of ignorance. And since ignorance is justly regarded as the chief promoter of superstition, that work is, therefore, a noble and beneficent work. But natural Sciences are only one aspect of SCIENCE and TRUTH Psychological and moral Sciences, or theosophy, the knowledge of divine truth, wheresoever found, are still more important in human affairs, and real Science should not be limited simply to the physical aspect of life and nature. Science is an abstract of every fact, a comprehension of every truth within the scope of human research and intelligence. “Shakespeare’s deep and accurate science in mental philosophy” (Coleridge), has proved more beneficent to the true philosopher in the study of the human heart—therefore, in the promotion of truth—than the more accurate, but certainly less deep, science of any Fellow of the Royal Institution.

Those readers, however, who do not find themselves convinced that the Church had no right to throw a slur upon a beautiful star, and that it did so through a mere necessity of accounting for one of its numerous loans from Paganism with all its poetical conceptions of the truths in Nature, are asked to read our article “The History of a Planet.” Perhaps, after its perusal, they will see how far Dupuis was justified in asserting that “all the theologies have their origin in astronomy.” With the modern Orientalists every myth is *solar*. This is one more prejudice, and a preconception in favour of materialism and physical science. It will be one of our duties to combat it with much of the rest.

Lucifer, September, 1887

THE HISTORY OF A PLANET

NO star, among the countless myriads that twinkle over the sidereal fields of the night sky, shines so dazzlingly as the planet Venus—not even Sirius-Sothis, the dog-star, beloved by Isis. Venus is the queen among our planets, the crown jewel of our solar system. She is the inspirer of the poet, the guardian and companion of the lonely shepherd, the lovely morning and the evening star. For,

“Stars teach as well as shine,”

although their secrets are still untold and unrevealed to the majority of men, including astronomers. They are “a beauty and a mystery,” verily. But “where there is a mystery, it is generally supposed that there must also be evil,” says Byron. Evil, therefore, was detected by evilly-disposed human fancy, even in those bright luminous eyes peeping at our wicked world through the veil of ether. Thus there came to exist slandered stars and planets as well as slandered men and women. Too often are the reputation and fortune of one man or party sacrificed for the benefit of another man or party. As on earth below, so in the heavens above, and Venus, the sister planet of our Earth,¹ was sacrificed to the ambition of our little globe to show the latter the “chosen” planet of the Lord. She became the scapegoat, the *Azazel* of the starry dome, for the sins of the Earth, or rather for those of a certain class in the human family—the clergy—who slandered the bright orb, in order to prove what their ambition suggested to them as the best means to reach power, and exercise it unswervingly over the

¹ “Venus is a second Earth,” says Reynaud, in *Terre et del* (p. 74), “so much so that were there any communication possible between the two planets, their inhabitants might take their respective earths for the two hemispheres of the same world. . . . They seem on the sky, like two sisters. Similar in conformation, these two worlds are also similar in the character assigned to them in the Universe.”

superstitious and ignorant masses.

This took place during the middle ages. And now the sin lies black at the door of Christians and their scientific inspirers, though the error was successfully raised to the lofty position of a religious dogma, as many other fictions and inventions have been.

Indeed, the whole sidereal world, planets and their regents—the ancient gods of poetical paganism—the sun, the moon, the elements, and the entire host of incalculable worlds—those at least which happened to be known to the Church Fathers—shared in the same fate. They have all been slandered, all bedevilled by the insatiable desire of proving one little system of theology—built on and constructed out of old pagan materials—the only right and holy one, and all those which preceded or followed it utterly wrong. Sun and stars, the very air itself, we are asked to believe, became pure and “redeemed” from original sin and the Satanic element of heathenism, only after the year I, A.D. Scholastics and scholiasts, the spirit of whom “spurned laborious investigation and slow induction,” had shown, to the satisfaction of infallible Church, the whole Kosmos in the power of Satan—a poor compliment to God—before the year of the Nativity; and Christians had to believe or be condemned. Never have subtle sophistry and casuistry shown themselves so plainly in their true light, however, as in the questions of the ex-Satanism and later redemption of various heavenly bodies. Poor beautiful Venus got worsted in that war of so-called divine proofs to a greater degree than any of her sidereal colleagues. While the history of the other six planets, and their gradual transformation from Greco-Aryan gods into Semitic devils, and finally into “divine attributes of the *seven eyes* of the Lord,” is known but to the educated, that of Venus-Lucifer has become a household story among even the most illiterate in Roman Catholic countries.

This story shall now be told for the benefit of those who may have neglected their astral mythology.

Venus, characterised by Pythagoras as the *sol alter*, a second Sun, on account of her magnificent radiance—equalled by none other—was the first to draw the attention of ancient Theogonists. Before it began to be called Venus, it was known in pre-Hesiodic

theogony as Eosphoros (or Phosphoros) and Hesperos, the children of the dawn and twilight. In Hesiod, moreover, the planet is decomposed into two divine beings, two brothers—Eosphoros (the *Lucifer* of the Latins) the morning, and Hesperos, the evening star. They are the children of Astroeos and Eos, the starry heaven and the dawn, as also of Kephalos and Eos (*Theog.*: 381, *Hyg. Poet. Astron.* 11, 42). Preller, quoted by Decharme, shows Phaeton identical with Phosphoros or Lucifer (*Grech. Mythol.*: I, 365). And on the authority of Hesiod he also makes Phaeton the son of the latter two divinities—Kephalos and Eos.

Now Phaeton or Phosphoros, the “luminous morning orb,” is carried away in his early youth by Aphrodite (Venus) who makes of him the night guardian of her sanctuary (*Theog.*: 987-991). He is the “beautiful morning star” (*vide* St. John’s *Revelation* XXII. 16) loved for its radiant light by the Goddess of the Dawn, Aurora, who, while gradually eclipsing the light of her beloved, thus seeming to carry off the star, makes it reappear on the evening horizon where it watches the gates of heaven. In early morning, Phosphoros “issuing from the waters of the Ocean, raises in heaven his sacred head to announce the approach of divine light.” (*Iliad*, XXIII. 226; *Odyss.*: XIII. 93; Virg: *Aeneid*, VIII. 589; *Mythol. de la Grece Antique*: 247). He holds a torch in his hand and flies through space as he precedes the car of Aurora. In the evening he becomes Hesperos, “the most splendid of the stars that shine on the celestial vault” (*Iliad*, XXII. 317). He is the father of the Hesperides, the guardians of the golden apples together with the Dragon; the beautiful genius of the flowing golden curls, sung and glorified in all the ancient *epithalami* (the bridal songs of the early Christians as of the pagan Greeks); he, who at the fall of the night, leads the nuptial *cortège* and delivers the bride into the arms of the bridegroom. (*Carmen Nup-tiale*. See *Mythol. de la Grece Antique*. Decharme.)

So far, there seems to be no possible *rapprochement*, no analogy to be discovered between this poetical personification of a star, a purely astronomical myth, and the *Satanism* of Christian theology. True, the close connection between the planet as Hesperos, the evening star, and the Greek Garden of Eden with its Dragon and the golden

apples may, with a certain stretch of imagination, suggest some painful comparisons with the third chapter of Genesis. But this is insufficient to justify the building of a theological wall of defence against paganism made up of slander and misrepresentations.

But of all the Greek *euhemerisations*, Lucifer-Eosphoros is, perhaps, the most complicated. The planet has become with the Latins, Venus, or *Aphrodite-Anadyomene* foam-born Goddess, the “Divine Mother,” and one with the Phoenician Astarte, or the Jewish Astaroth. They were all called “The Morning Star,” and the Virgins of the Sea, or *Mar* (whence Mary), the great Deep, titles now given by the Roman Church to their Virgin Mary. They were all connected with the moon and the crescent, with the Dragon and the planet Venus, as the mother of Christ has been made connected with all these attributes. If the Phoenician mariners carried, fixed on the prow of their ships, the image of the goddess Astarte (or Aphrodite, Venus Erycina) and looked upon the evening and the morning star as *their* guiding star, “the eye of their Goddess mother,” so do the Roman Catholic sailors the same to this day. They fix a Madonna on the prows of their vessels, and the blessed Virgin Mary is called the “Virgin of the Sea.” The accepted patroness of Christian sailors, their star, “*Stella Del Mar*,” etc., she stands on the crescent moon. Like the old pagan Goddesses, she is the “Queen of Heaven,” and the “Morning Star” just as they were.

Whether this can explain anything, is left to the reader’s sagacity. Meanwhile, Lucifer-Venus has nought to do with darkness, and everything with light. When called *Lucifer*, it is the “light bringer,” the first radiant beam which destroys the lethal darkness of night. When named Venus, the planet-star becomes the symbol of dawn, the chaste Aurora, Professor Max Muller rightly conjectures that Aphrodite, born of the sea, is a personification of the Dawn of Day, and the most lovely of all the sights in Nature (“Science of Language”) for, before her naturalisation by the Greeks, Aphrodite was Nature personified, the life and light of the Pagan world, as proven in the beautiful invocation to Venus by Lucretius, quoted by Decharme. She is *divine* Nature in her entirety, *Aditi-Prakriti* before she becomes Lakshmi. She is that Nature before whose majestic and fair face, “the winds fly away, the quieted sky pours torrents of light, and the sea-waves smile,”

(Lucretius). When referred to as the Syrian goddess Astarte, the Astaroth of Hieropolis, the radiant planet was personified as a majestic woman, holding in one outstretched hand a torch, in the other, a crooked staff in the form of a cross. (*Vide* Lucian’s *De Dea Syrie*, and Cicero’s *De Nat. Deorum*. 3 c. 23). Finally, the planet is represented astronomically, as a globe *poised above the cross*—a symbol no devil would like to associate with—while the planet Earth is a globe with a cross *over it*.

But then, these crosses are not the symbols of Christianity, but the Egyptian *crux ansata*, the attribute of Isis (who is Venus, and Aphrodite, Nature, also) or Venus the planet; the fact that the Earth has the *crux ansata* reversed, it having a great occult significance upon which there is no necessity of entering at present.

Now what says the Church and how does it explain the “dreadful association”? The Church believes in the devil, of course, and could not afford to lose him. “*The Devil is the chief pillar of the Church*” confesses unblushingly an advocate² of the *Ecclesia Militans*. “All the Alexandrian Gnostics speak to us of the fall of the iEons and their Pleroma, and all attribute that fall *to the desire to know*” writes another volunteer in the same army, slandering the Gnostics as usual and identifying *the desire to know* or occultism, magic, with satanism.³ And then, forthwith, he quotes from Schlegel’s *Philosophie de V Historie* to show that the seven rector (planets) of Pymander, “commissioned by God to contain the phenomenal world in their seven circles, lost in love with their own beauty,⁴ came to admire themselves with such intensity that owing to this proud self-adulation they finally *fell*”

Perversity having thus found its way amongst the angels, the most beautiful creature of God “revolted against its Maker.” That creature is in theological fancy Venus-Lucifer, or rather the informing Spirit or

2 Thus saith Des Mousseaux. “Moeurs et Pratiques des Demons.” p.X—and he is corroborated in this by Cardinal de Ventura. The Devil, he says, “is one of the great personages whose life is closely allied to that of the Church; and without him . . . the fall of man could not have taken place. If it were not for him (the Devil), the Saviour, the Redeemer, the Crucified would be but the most ridiculous of supernumeraries and the Cross an insult to good sense.” And if so, then we should feel thankful to the poor Devil.

3 De M/rville. “No Devil, no Christ,” he exclaims.

4 This is only another version of Narcissus, the Greek victim of his own fair looks.

Regent of that planet. This teaching is based on the following speculation. The three principal heroes of the great sidereal catastrophe mentioned in *Revelation* are, according to the testimony of the Church fathers—"the Verbum, Lucifer his usurper (see editorial) and the grand Archangel who conquered him," and whose "palaces" (the "houses" astrology calls them) are in the Sun, Venus-Lucifer and Mercury. This is quite evident, since the position of these orbs in the Solar system correspond in their hierarchical order to that of the "heroes" in Chapter xii of *Revelation* "their names and destinies (?) being closely connected in the theological (exoteric) system with these three great metaphysical names. (De Mirville's *Memoir* to the Academy of France, on the rapping Spirits and the Demons.)

The outcome of this was, that theological legend made of Venus-Lucifer the sphere and domain of the fallen Archangel, or Satan before his apostacy. Called upon to reconcile this statement with that other fact, that the metaphor of "the morning star," is applied to both Jesus, and his Virgin mother, and that the planet Venus-Lucifer is included, moreover, among the "stars of the seven planetary spirits worshipped by the Roman Catholics⁵ under new names, the defenders of the Latin dogmas and beliefs answer as follows:—

"Lucifer, the jealous neighbour of the Sun (Christ) said to himself in his great pride: 'I will rise as high as he!' He was thwarted in his design by Mercury, though the brightness of the latter (who is St. Michael) was as much lost in the blazing fires of the great Solar orb as his own was, and though, like Lucifer, Mercury is only the assessor, and the guard of honour to the Sun." *{Ibid.}*

Guards of "dishonour" now rather, if the teachings of *theological* Christianity were true. But here comes in the cloven foot of the Jesuit.

⁵ The famous temple dedicated to the Seven Angels at Rome, and built by Michael-Angelo in 1561, is still there, now called the "Church of St. Mary of the Angels." In the old Roman Missals printed in 1563—one or two of which may still be seen in Palazzo Barberini—one may find the religious service (officio) of the seven angels, and their old and occult names. That the "angels" are the pagan Rectors, under different names—the Jewish having replaced the Greek and Latin names—of the seven planets is proven by what Pope Pius V said in his Bull to the Spanish Clergy, permitting and encouraging the worship of the said seven spirits of the stars. "One cannot exalt too much these seven rectors of the world, figured by the seven planets, as it is consoling to our century to witness by the grace of God the cult of these seven ardent lights, and of these seven stars reassuming all its lustre in the Christian republic." (Les Sept Esprits et l'Histoire de leur Cu'te; De Mirville's 2nd memoir addressed to the academy, Vol. II. p. 358.)

The ardent defender of Roman Catholic Demonolatry and of the worship of the seven planetary spirits, at the same time, pretends great wonder at the coincidences between old Pagan and Christian legends, between the fable about mercury and Venus, and the *historical truths* told of St. Michael—the "angel of the face,"—the terrestrial double, or *ferouer* of Christ. He points them out saying: "like Mercury, the archangel Michael, is the *friend* of the Sun, his Mitra, perhaps, for Michael is a *psychopompic* genius, one who leads the separated souls to their appointed abodes, and like Mitra, he is the *well-known adversary of the demons.*" This is demonstrated by the book of the *Nabatheans* recently discovered (by Chwolson), in which the Zoroastrian Mitra is called the "*grand enemy of the planet Venus.*"⁶(*Ibidp.* 160.)

There is something in this. A candid confession, for once, of perfect identity of celestial personages and of *borrowing* from every pagan source. It is curious, if unblushing. While in the oldest Mazdean allegories, Mitra conquers the planet Venus, in Christian tradition Michael defeats Lucifer, and both receive, as war spoils, the planet of the vanquished deity.

"Mitra," says Dollinger, "possessed, in days of old, the star of Mercury, placed between the sun and the moon, but he was given the planet of the conquered, and ever since his victory he is identified with Venus." ("*Judaisme and Paganisme*" Vol. II., p. 109. French transl.)

"In the Christian tradition," adds the learned Marquis, "St. Michael is apportioned in Heaven the throne and the palace of the foe he has vanquished. Moreover, like Mercury, during the palmy days of paganism, which made sacred to this *demon-god* all the promontories of the earth, *the Archangel is the patron of the same in our religion.*" This means, if it does mean anything, that *now*, at any rate, Lucifer-Venus is a *sacred* planet, and no synonym of Satan, since St. Michael has become his legal heir?

The above remarks conclude with this cool reflection:

⁶ Herodotes showing the identity of Mitra and Venus, the sentence in the Nabathean Agriculture is evidently misunderstood.

“It is evident that paganism has *utilised beforehand*, and most marvellously, all the features and characteristics of the *prince of the face of the Lord* (Michael) in applying them to that *Mercury*, to the Egyptian *Hermes Anubis*, and the *Hermes Christos* of the Gnostics. Each of these was represented as the first among the divine councillors, and the god nearest to the sun, *quis ut Deus*.”

Which title, with all its attributes, became that of Michael. The good Fathers, the Master Masons of the temple of *Church Christianity*, knew indeed how to utilize pagan material for their new dogmas.

The fact is, that it is sufficient to examine certain Egyptian *cartouches*, pointed out by Rossellini (*Egypte*, Vol. L, p. 289), to find Mercury (the double of Sirius in our solar system) as Sothis, preceded by the words “*sole*” and “*solis custode, sosteg-non dei dominanti, e forte grande dei vigilant*,” watchman of the sun, sustainer of dominions, and the strongest of all the vigilants.” All these titles and attributes are now those of the Archangel Michael, who has inherited them from the *demons* of paganism.

Moreover, travellers in Rome may testify to the wonderful presence in the statue of Mitra, at the Vatican, of the best known Christian symbols. Mystics boast of it. They find “in his lion’s head, and the eagle’s wings, those of the courageous Seraph, the master of space (Michael); in his caduceus, the spear, in the two serpents coiled round the body, the struggle of the good and bad principles, and especially in the two keys which the said Mitra holds, like St. Peter, the keys with which this Seraph-patron of the latter opens and shuts the gates of Heaven, *astra cludit et recludit*” (*Mem.* p. 162.)

To sum up, the aforesaid shows that the theological romance of Lucifer was built upon the various myths and allegories of the pagan world, and that it is no *revealed* dogma, but simply one invented to uphold superstition. Mercury being one of the Sun’s *assessors*, or the *cynocephali* of the Egyptians and *the watch-dogs of the Sun*, literally, the other was *Eosphoros*, the most brilliant of the planets, “*qui mane oriebaris*,” the early rising, or the Greek *oPQPTrVos*. It was identical with the *Amoon-ra*, the light-bearer of Egypt, and called by all nations “the *second born* of light” (the first being Mercury),

the beginning of his (the Sun’s) ways of wisdom, the Archangel Michael being also referred to as the *prin-ciplum viarum Domini*.

Thus a purely astronomical personification, built upon an occult meaning which no one has hitherto seemed to unriddle outside the Eastern wisdom, has now become a dogma, part and parcel of Christian revelation. A clumsy transference of characters is unequal to the task of making thinking people accept in one and the same trinitarian group, the “Word” or Jesus, God and Michael (with the Virgin occasionally to complete it) on the one hand, and Mitra, Satan and Apollo-Abaddon on the other: the whole at the whim and pleasure of Roman Catholic Scholiasts. If Mercury and Venus (Lucifer) are (astronomically in their revolution around the Sun) the symbols of God the Father, the Son, and of their Vicar, Michael, the “Dragon-Conqueror,” in Christian legend, why should they when called *Apollo-Abaddon*, the “King of the Abyss,” Lucifer, Satan, or Venus—become forthwith devils and demons? If we are told that the “conqueror,” or “Mercury-Sun,” or again St. Michael of the *Revelation*, was given the spoils of the conquered angel, namely, his planet, why should opprobrium be any longer attached to a constellation so purified? Lucimfer is now the “Angel of the Face of the Lord,”⁷ because “that face is mirrored in it.” We think rather, because the Sun is reflecting his beams in Mercury seven times more than it does on our Earth, and twice more in Lucifer-Venus: the Christian symbol proving again its astronomical origin. But whether from the astronomical, mystical or symbological aspect, Lucifer is as good as any other planet. To advance as a proof of its demoniacal character, and identity with Satan, the configuration of Venus, which gives to the crescent of this planet the appearance of a cut-off horn is rank nonsense. But to connect this with the horns of “The Mystic Dragon” in *Revelation*—“one of which was broken”⁸—as the two French Demonologists, the Marquis de Mirville and the

7 “Both in Biblical and pagan theologies,” says de Mirville, “the Sun has its god, its defender, and its sacrilegious usurper, in other words, its Ormuzd, its planet Mercury (Mitra), and its Lucifer, Venus (or Ahriman), taken away from its ancient master, and now given to its conqueror.” (P. 164). Therefore, Lucifer-Venus is qu/te holy now.

8 In Revelation there is no “horn broken,” but it is simply said in Chapter XIII, 3, that John saw “one of his heads, as it were, wounded to death.” John knew naught in his generation of “a horned” devil.

Chevalier des Mousseaux, the champions of the Church militant, would have their readers believe in the second half of our present century—is simply an insult to the public.

Besides which, the Devil had no horns before the fourth century of the Christian era. It is a purely Patristic invention arising from their desire to connect the god Pan, and the pagan Fauns and Satyrs, with their Satanic legend. The demons of Heathendom were as hornless and as tailless as the Archangel Michael himself in the imaginations of his worshippers. The “horns” were, in pagan symbolism, an emblem of divine power and creation, and of fertility in nature. Hence the ram’s horns of Ammon, of Bacchus, and of Moses on ancient medals, and the cow’s horns of Isis and Diana, etc., etc., and of the Lord God of the Prophets of Israel himself. For Habakkuk gives the evidence that this symbolism was accepted by the “chosen people” as much as by the Gentiles. In Chapter III that prophet speaks of the “Holy One from Mount Paran,” of the Lord God who “comes from Teman, and whose brightness was as the light,” and who had “horns coming out of his hand.”

When one reads, moreover, the Hebrew text of Isaiah, and finds that no Lucifer is mentioned at all in Chapter XIV., v. 12, but simply *Hillel*, “a bright star,” one can hardly refrain from wondering that *educated* people should be still ignorant enough at the close of our century to associate a radiant planet—or anything else in nature for the matter of that—with the DEVIL!⁹

H. P. B.

⁹ The literal words used, and their translation, are: “Aik Naphelta Mi-Shamayim Hillel Ben-Shachar Negdanta La-Aretz Cholesch El-Goum,” or, “How art thou fallen from the heavens, Hillel, Son of the Morning, how art thou cast down unto the earth, thou who didst cast down the nations” Here the word, translated “Lucifer,” is Hillel, and its meaning is “shining brightly or gloriously.” It is very true also, that by a pun to which Hebrew words lend themselves so easily, the verb hillel may be made to mean “to howl,” hence, by an easy derivation, hillel may be constructed into “howler;” or a devil, a creature, however, one hears rarely, if ever, “howling.” In his Lexicon, Parkhurst says: “The Syriac translation of this passage renders it ‘howl;’ and even Jerome observes ‘that it literally means ‘to howl.’ Michaelis translates it, ‘Howl, Son of the Morning.’” But at this rate, Hillel, the great Jewish sage and reformer, might also be called a “howler,” and connected with the devil!

Lucifer, July 1888

STAR-ANGEL-WORSHIP

IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

[The subject matter of the present article has not been chosen from any desire of “finding fault” with the Christian *religion*, as LUCIFER is often accused of doing. No special animosity is felt towards popery any more than against any other existing dogmatic and ritualistic faith. We merely hold that “there is no higher religion than truth.” Hence, being incessantly attacked by the Christians—among whom none are so bitter and *contemptuous* as the Romanists—who call us “Idolaters” and “heathens,” and otherwise denounce us, it is necessary that at times something should be said in our defence, and truth reestablished.

The Theosophists are accused of believing in Astrology, and the *Devas* (Dhyān Chohans) of the Hindus and Northern Buddhists. A too impulsive missionary in the Central Provinces of India has actually called us “Astrolaters,” “Sabians” and “fifey/Y-worshippers.” This, as usual, is an unfounded calumny and a misrepresentation. No theosophist, no *Occultist* in the true sense of the word has ever *worshipped* Devas, Nats, Angels or even *planetary* spirits. Recognition of the *actual existence* of such Beings—which, however exalted, are still gradually evolved *creatures* and finite—and even reverence for some of them is not *worship*. The latter is an elastic word, one that has been made threadbare by the poverty of the English tongue. We address a magistrate as his “worship,” but it can hardly be said that we pay to him *divine* honours. A mother often worships her children, a husband his wife, and *vice versa*, but none of these prays to the object of his worship. But in neither case does it apply to the Occultists. An Occultist’s reverence for certain high Spirits may be very great in some cases; aye, perhaps even as great as the reverence felt by some Christians for their Archangels Michael and Gabriel and their (St.) George of Cappadocia—the learned purveyor of Constantine’s armies. But it stops there. For the Theosophists these planetary “angels” occupy no higher place than that which Virgil assigns them:

They boast ethereal vigour and are form’d
From seeds of heavenly birth,

as does also every mortal. Each and all are occult potencies having sway over certain attributes of nature. And, if once attracted to a mortal, they do

help him in certain things. Yet, on the whole, the less one has to do with them the better.

Not so with the Roman Catholics, our pious detractors. The Papists worship them and have rendered to them *divine horn- \ age* from the beginning of Christianity to this day, and in the full acceptance of the italicised words, as this article will prove, Even for the Protestants, the Angels in general, if not the Seven Angels of the Stars particularly—are “Harbingers of the Most High” and ‘Ministering Spirits” to whose protection they appeal, and who have their distinct place in the Book of Common Prayer.

The fact that the Star and Planetary Angels are worshipped by the Papists is not generally known. The cult had many vicissitudes. It was several times abolished, then again permitted. It is the short history of its growth, its last re-establishment and the recurrent efforts to proclaim this worship openly, of which a brief sketch is here attempted. This worship may be regarded for the last few years as *obsolete*, yet to this day it was never abolished. Therefore it will now be my pleasure to prove that if anyone deserves the name of “idolatrous,” it is not the Theosophists, Occultists, Kabalists and Astrologers, but, indeed, most of the Christians; those Roman Catholics, who, besides the Star-angels, worship a Kyriel of more or less problematical saints and the Virgin Mary, of whom their Church has made a regular *goddess*.

The short bits of history that follow are extracted from various trustworthy sources, such as the Roman Catholics will find it rather difficult to gainsay or repudiate. For our authorities are (a), various documents *in the archives of the Vatican*; (b), sundry works by pious and well-known Roman Catholic writers, Ultramontanes to the backbone—lay and ecclesiastical authors; and finally (c), a Papal Bull, than which no better evidence could be found.]

IN the middle of the VHIth century of the Christian era the very notorious Archbishop Adalbert of Magdeburg, famous as few in the annals of magic, appeared before his judges. He was charged with, and ultimately convicted—by the second Council of Rome presided over by Pope Zacharia—of using during his performances of ceremonial magic the names of the “seven Spirits”—then at the height of their power in the Church— among others, that of URIEL, with the help of whom he had succeeded in producing his greatest phenomena. As can be easily shown, *the church is not against magic proper*, but only against those magicians who

fail to conform to her methods and rules of evocation. However, as the wonders wrought by the Right Reverend Sorcerer were not of a character that would permit of their classification among “miracles by the grace, and to the glory of God,” they were declared *unholy*. Moreover, the Archangel URIEL (*lux et ignis*) having been compromised by such exhibitions, his name had to be discredited. But, as such a disgrace upon one of the “Thrones” and Messengers of the Most High” would have reduced the number of these Jewish *Saptarishis* to only six, and thus have thrown into confusion the whole celestial hierarchy, a very clever and crafty subterfuge was resorted to. It was, however, neither new, nor has it proved very convincing or efficacious.

It was declared that Bishop Adalbert’s Uriel, the “fire of God,” was not the Archangel mentioned in the second Book of Esdras; nor was he the glorious personage so often named in the magical books of Moses—especially in the 6th and 7th. The sphere or planet of this original Uriel was said, by Michael Glycas the Byzantine, to be the Sun. How then could this exalted being—the friend and companion of Adam in Eden before his fall, and, later, the chum of Seth and Enoch, as all pious Christians know— how could he ever have given a helping hand to sorcery? Never, never! the idea alone was absurd.

Therefore, the Uriel so revered by the Fathers of the Church, remained as unassailable and as immaculate as ever. It was a *devil* of the same name—an obscure devil, one must think, since he is nowhere mentioned—who had to pay the penalty of Bishop Adalbert’s little transactions in black magic. This “*bad*” Uriel is, as a certain tonsured advocate has tried hard to insinuate, connected with a certain significant word of occult nature, used by and known only to Masons of a very high degree. Ignorant of the “word” itself, however, the defender has most gloriously failed to prove his version.

Such whitewashing of the archangel’s character was of course necessary in view of the special worship paid to him. St. Am-brosius had chosen Uriel as a patron and paid him almost divine reverence.¹ Again the famous Father Gastaldi, the Dominican monk, writer and

¹ De Fide adgratiam, Book III.

Inquisitor, had proven in his curious work “On the Angels” (*De Angelis*) that the worship of the “Seven Spirits” by the Church had been and was *legal* in all the ages; and that it was necessary for the moral support and faith of the children of the (Roman) Church. In short that he who should neglect these gods was as bad as any “heathen” who did not.

Though sentenced and suspended, Bishop Adalbert had a formidable party in Germany, one that not only defended and supported the sorcerer himself, but also the disgraced Archangel. Hence, the name of Uriel was left in the missals after the trial, the “Throne” merely remaining “under suspicion.” In accordance with her admirable policy the Church having declared that the “blessed Uriel,” had nought to do with the “accursed Uriel” of the Kabalists, the matter rested there.

To show the great latitude offered to such subterfuges, the occult tenets about the celestial Hosts have only to be remembered. The world of Being begins with the Spiritual Fire (or Sun) and its seven “Flames” or Rays. These “Sons of Light,” called the “multiple” because, allegorically speaking they belong to, and lead a simultaneous existence in heaven and on earth, easily furnished a handle to the Church to hang her *dual* Uriel upon. Moreover, Devas, Dhyan-Chohans, Gods and Archangels are all identical and are made to change their Protean forms, names and positions, *ad libitum*. As the sidereal gods of the Sabians became the kabalistic and talmudistic angels of the Jews with their esoteric names unaltered, so they passed bag and baggage into the Christian Church as the archangels, exalted only in their office.

These names are their “mystery” titles. So mysterious are they, indeed, that the Roman Catholics themselves are not sure of them, now that the Church, in her anxiety to hide their humble origin, has changed and altered them about a dozen times. This is what the pious de Mirville confesses:

“To speak with precision and certainty, as we might like to, about everything in connection with their (the angels’) names and attributes is not an easy task. . . . For when one has said that these spirits are

the *seven assistants* that surround the throne of the Lamb and form its seven *horns*; that the famous seven-branched candlestick of the Temple was their type and symbol . . . when we have shown them figured in *Revelation* by the *seven stars* in the Saviour’s hand, or by the angels letting loose the *seven plagues*— we shall but have stated once more one of those incomplete truths which we have to handle with such caution.” (*Of the Spirits before their Fall.*)

Here the author utters a great truth. He would have uttered one still greater, though, had he added that *no truth*, upon *any subject* whatever, has been ever made complete by the Church. Otherwise, where would be the mystery so absolutely necessary to the authority of the ever incomprehensible dogmas of the Holy “Bride”?

These “Spirits” are called *primarli principes*. But what these first Principles are in reality is not explained. In the first centuries of Christianity the Church would not do so; and in this one she knows of them no more than her faithful lay sons do. She has lost the secret.

The question concerning the definite adoption of names for these angels, de Mirville tells us—“has given rise to controversies that have lasted for centuries. To this day *these seven names are a mystery.*”

Yet they are found in certain missals and in the secret documents at the Vatican, along with the astrological names known to many. But as the Kabalists, and among others Bishop Adalbert* have used some of them, the Church will not accept these titles, though she worships the creatures. The usual names accepted are *Mikael*, the “*quis ut Deus*” the “like unto God”; *GABRIEL*, the “strength (or power) of God”; *RAPHAEL*, or “divine virtue”; *URIEL*, “God’s light and fire”; *SCALTIEL*, the “speech of God”; *JEHUDIEL*, the “praise of God” and *BARACHIEL*, the “blessing of God.” These “seven” are *absolutely canonical*, but they are not the true mystery names—the magical *POTENCIES*. And even among the “substitutes,” as just shown, Uriel’has been greatly compromised and the three last enumerated are pronounced “suspicious.” Nevertheless, though nameless, they are still worshipped. Nor is it true to say that no trace of these three names—so “suspicious”—is anywhere found in the Bible, for they are mentioned in certain of the old Hebrew scrolls. One of them is named in Chapter

XVI of *Genesis*—the angel who appears to Hagar; and all the three appear as “the Lord” (the Elohim) to Abraham in the plains of Mamre, as the “three men” who announced to Sarai the birth of Isaac (*Genesis*, XVIII). “Jehudiel,” moreover, is distinctly named in Chapter XXIII of *Exodus*, as the angel in whom was “the name” (*praise* in the original) of God (*Vide* verse 21). It is through their “divine attributes,” which have led to the formation of the names, that these archangels may be identified by an easy esoteric method of transmutation with the Chaldeangreat gods and even with the Seven Manus and the Seven Rishis of India.² They are the *Seven Sabian Gods*, and the *Seven Seats* (Thrones) and Virtues of the Kabalists; and now they have become with the Catholics, their “Seven Eyes of the Lord,” and the “Seven *Thrones*” instead of “Seats.”

Both Kabalists and “Heathen” must feel quite flattered to thus see their Devas and Rishis become the “Ministers Plenipotentiary” of the Christian God. And now the narrative may be continued unbroken.

Until about the XVth century after the misadventure of Bishop Adalbert, the names of only the first three Archangels out of the seven stood in the Church in their full odour of sanctity. The other four remained ostracised—as *names*.

Whoever has been in Rome must have visited the privileged temple of the Seven Spirits, especially built for them by Michael Angelo: the famous church known as “St. Mary of the Angels.” Its history is curious but very little known to the public that frequents it. It is worthy, however, of being recorded.

In 1460, there appeared in Rome a great “Saint,” named Amadceus. He was a nobleman from Lusitania, who already in Portugal had become famous for his prophecies and beatific visions.³ During one of such he had a revelation. The seven Archangels appeared to the holy man, so beloved by the Pope that Sixtus IV had actually permitted

² He who knows anything of the Puranas and their allegories, knows that the Rishis therein as well as the Manus are Sons of God, of Brahma, and themselves gods; that they become men and then, as Saptarishi, they turn into stars and constellations. Finally that they are first 7, then 10 then 14, and finally 21. The occult meaning is evident.

³ He died at Rome in 1482.

him to build on the site of St. Peter in *Montorio* a Franciscan monastery. And having appeared they revealed to him their genuine *bona fide* mystery names. The names used by the Church were substitutes, they said. So they were, and the “angels” spoke truthfully. Their business with Amadceus was a modest request. They demanded to be legally recognized under their legitimate patronymics, to receive public worship and have a temple of their own. Now the Church in her great wisdom had declined these names from the first, as being those of Chaldean gods, and had substituted for them astrological *aliases*. This then, could not be done; as “they were names of demons” explains Baronius. But so were the “substitutes” in Chal-dea before they were altered for a purpose in the Hebrew Angel-ology. And if they are *names of demons*, asks pertinently de Mirville, “why are they yet given to Christians and Roman Catholics at baptism?” The truth is that if the last four enumerated are demon-names, so must be those of Michael, Gabriel and Raphael.

But the “holy” visitors were a match for the Church in obstinacy. At the same hour that Amadoeus had his vision at Rome, in Sicily, at Palermo, another wonder was taking place. A miraculously-painted picture of the Seven Spirits, was as miraculously exhumed from under the ruins of an old chapel. On the painting *the same seven mystery names* that were being revealed at that hour to Amadoeus were also found *inscribed* “under the portrait of each angel,”⁴ says the chronicler.

Whatever might be in this our age of unbelief the feelings of the great and learned leaders of various psychic and telepathic societies on this subject, Pope Sixtus IV was greatly impressed by the *coincidence*. He believed in Amadoeus as implicitly as Mr. Brudenel believed in the Abyssinian prophet, “Herr Paulus.”⁵ But this was by no means the only “coincidence” of the day. The Holy Roman and Apostolic Church was built on such miracles, and continues to stand on them now as on the rock of Truth; for God has ever sent to her

⁴ Des Esprits &c., par de Mirville.

⁵ “Herr Paulus”—the no less miraculous production of Mr. Walter Besant’s rather muddled and very one-sided fancy.

timely miracles.⁶ Therefore, when also, on that very same day, an old prophecy written in very archaic Latin, and referring to both the find and the revelation was *discovered* at Pisa—it produced quite a commotion among the faithful. The prophecy foretold, you see, *the revival of the* “Planetary-Angel” worship for that period. Also that during the reign of Pope Clement VII, the convent of St. Francois de Paul would be raised on the emplacement of the little ruined chapel. “The event occurred as predicted,” boasts de Mirville, forgetting that the Church had made the prediction true herself, by following the command implied in it. Yet this is called a “prophecy” to this day.

But it was only in the XVIth century that the Church consented at last to comply on every point with the request of her “high-born” celestial petitioners.

At that time though there was hardly a church or chapel in Italy

⁶ En passant—a remark may be made and a query propounded:

The “miracles” performed in the bosom of Mother Church—from the apostolic down to the ecclesiastical miracles at Lourdes—if not more remarkable than those attributed to “Herr Paulus,” are at any rate far more wide-reaching, hence, more pernicious in their result upon the human mind. Either both kinds are possible, or both are due to fraud and dangerous hypnotic and magnetic powers possessed by some men. Now Mr. W. Besant evidently tries to impress upon his readers that his novel was written in the interests of that portion of society which is so easily fooled by the other. And if so, why then not have traced all such phenomena to their original and primeval source, i.e., belief in the possibility of supernatural occurrences because of the in-culcated belief in the MIRACLES in the Bible, and their continuation by the Church? No Abyssinian prophet, as no “occult philosopher,” has ever made such large claims to “miracle” and divine help—and no Peter’s pence expected, either—as the “Bride of Christ”—she, of Rome, Why has not then our author, since he was so extremely anxious to save the millions of England from delusion, and so very eager to expose the pernicious means used—why has he not tried to first explode the greater humbug, before he ever touched the minor tricks—if any? Let him first explain to the British public the turning of water into wine and the resurrection of Lazarus on the half hypnotic and half jugglery and fraud hypothesis. For, if one set of wonders may be explained by blind belief and mesmerism, why not the other? Or is it because the Bible miracles believed in by every Protestant and Catholic (with the divine miracles at Lourdes thrown into the bargain by the latter) cannot be as easily handled by an author who desires to remain popular as those of the “occult philosopher” and the spiritual medium? Indeed, no courage, no fearless defiance of the consequences are required to denounce the helpless and now very much scared professional medium. But all these qualifications and an ardent love of truth into the bargain, are absolutely necessary if one would beard Mrs Grundy in her den. For this the traducers of the “Esoteric Buddhists” are too prudent and wily. They only seek cheap popularity with the scoffer and the materialist. Well, sure they are, that no professional medium will ever dare call them wholesale slanderers to their faces, or seek redress from them so long as the law against palmistry is staring him in the face. As to the “Esoteric Buddhist” or “Occult Philosopher,” there is still less danger from this quarter. The contempt of the latter for all the would-be traducers is absolute and it requires more than the clumsy denunciations of a novelist to disturb them. And why should they feel annoyed? As they are neither professional prophets nor do they benefit by St. Peter’s pence, the most malicious calumny can only make them laugh. Mr. Walter Besant, however, has said a great truth in his novel, a true pearl of foresight, dropped on a heap of mire: the “occult philosopher” does not propose to “hide his light under a bushel.”

without a copy of the *miraculous* picture in painting or mosaic, and that actually, in 1516, a splendid “temple to the seven spirits” had been raised and finished near the ruined chapel at Palermo—still the “angels” failed to be satisfied. In the words of their chronicler—“the blessed spirits were not contented with Sicily alone, and secret prayers. They wanted a world-wide worship and the whole Catholic world to recognize them publicly.”

Heavenly denizens themselves, as it seems, are not quite free from the ambition and the vanities of our material plane! This is what the ambitious “Rectors” devised to obtain that which they wanted.

Antonio Duca, another seer (in the annals of the Church of Rome) had been just appointed rector of the Palermo “temple of the seven spirits.” About that period, he began to have the same beatific visions as Amadceus had. The Archangels were now urging the Popes through him to recognize them, and to establish a regular and a universal worship in their *own names*, just as it was before Bishop Adalbert’s scandal. They insisted upon having a special temple built *for them alone*, and they wanted it upon the ancient site of the famous *Thermos* of Diocletian. To the erection of these *Thermce*, agreeably with tradition, 40,000 Christians and 10,000 martyrs had been condemned, and helped in this task by such famous “Saints” as Marcellus and Thraso. Since then, however, as stated in Bull LV by the Pope Pius IV, “this den had remained set apart for the most profane usages and demon (magic?) rites.”

But as it appears from sundry documents, all did not go quite as smooth as the “blessed spirits” would have liked, and the poor Duca had a hard time of it. Notwithstanding the strong protection of the Colonna families who used all their influence with Pope Paul III, and the personal request of Marguerite of Austria, the daughter of Charles Vth, “the seven spirits” could not be satisfied, for the same mysterious (and to us very clear) reasons, though propitiated and otherwise honoured in every way. The difficult mission of Duca, in fact, was crowned with success only thirty-four years later. Ten years before, however, namely in 1551, the preparatory purification of the *Thermos* had been ordered by Pope Julius III, and a first church had been built

under the name of “S7. *Mary of the Angels*” But the “Blessed Thrones,” feeling displeased with its name, brought on a war during which this temple was plundered and destroyed, as if instead of glorified Archangels they had been maleficent kabalistic *Spooks*.

After this, they went on appearing to seers and saints, with greater frequency than before, and clamoured even more loudly for a special place of worship. They *demand*ed the re-erection on the same spot (the *Thermce*) of a temple which should be called the “Church of the *Seven Angels*”

But there was the same difficulty as before. The Popes had pronounced the original titles demon-names, *i.e.*, those of Pagan gods, and to introduce them into the church service would have been fatal. The “mystery names” of the seven angels could not be given. True enough, when the old “miraculous” picture with the seven names on it had been found, these names had been freely used in the church services. But, at the period of the *Renaissance*, Pope Clement XI had ordered a special report to be made on them as they stood on the picture. It was a famous astronomer of that day, a Jesuit, named Joseph Biancini, who was entrusted with this delicate mission. The result to which the inquest led, was as unexpected as it was fatal to the worshippers of the seven Sabian gods; the Pope, while commanding that the picture should be preserved, ordered the seven angelic names to be *carefully rubbed out*. And “though these names are traditional,” and “although they have *naught to do* with,” and are “very different from the names used by Adalbert” (the Bishop-magician of Magdeburg), as the chronicler cunningly adds, yet even their mention was forbidden in the holy churches of Rome.

Thus affairs went on from 1527 till 1561; the Rector trying to satisfy the orders of his *seven* “guides,”—the church fearing to adopt even the Chaldean substitutes for the “mystery-names” as they had been so “desecrated by magical practices.” We are not told, however, why the mystery-names, far less known than their substitutes have ever been, should not have been given out if the blessed “Thrones” enjoyed the smallest confidence. But, it must have been “small” indeed, since one finds the “Seven Archangels” demanding their restitution

for 34 years, and refusing positively to be called by any other name, and the church still deaf to their desires. The Occultists do not conceal the reason why they have ceased to use them: *they are dangerously magical*. But why should the Church fear them? Have not the Apostles, and Peter pre-eminently, been told “whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven,” and were they not given power over every demon known and unknown? Nevertheless, some of the mystery names may be still found along with their substitutes in old Roman missals printed in 1563. There is one in the Barberini library with the whole mass-service in it, and the forbidden truly Sabian names of the seven “great gods” flashing out ominously hither and thither.

The “gods” lost patience once more. Acting in a truly Jehovistic spirit with their “stiff-necked” worshippers, they sent a plague. A terrible epidemic of *obsession* and *possession* broke out in 1553, “when almost all Rome found itself possessed by the devil,” says de Mirville (without explaining whether the clergy were included). Then only Duca’s wish was realized. His seven Inspirers were invoked in their own names, and “the epidemic ceased as by enchantment, the blessed ones,” adds the chronicler, “proving by the divine powers they possessed, once more, that they had nothing in common *with the demons of the same name*”—*i.e.*, the Chaldean gods.⁷

“Then Michael Angelo was summoned in all haste by Paul IV to the Vatican.” His magnificent plan was accepted and the building of the former church begun. Its construction lasted over three years. In the archives of this now celebrated edifice, one can read that: “the narrative of the miracles that occurred during that period could not be undertaken, as it was *one incessant miracle of three years’ duration*” In the presence of all his cardinals, Pope Paul IV ordered that the seven names, as originally written on the picture, should be restored, and inscribed around the large copy from it that surmounts to this day the high altar.

The admirable temple was consecrated to the Seven Angels in 1561. The object of the Spirits was reached; three years later, nearly

⁷ But they had proved their power earlier by sending the war, the destruction of the church, and finally the epidemic; and this does not look very angelic—to an Occultist.

simultaneously, Michael Angelo and Antonio Duca both died. They were no longer wanted.

Duca was the first person buried in the church for the erection of which he had fought the best part of his life and finally procured for his heavenly patrons. On his tomb the summary of the revelations obtained by him, as also the catalogue of the prayers and invocations, of the penances and fasts used as means of getting the “blessed” revelations and more frequent visits from the “Seven”—are engraved. In the vestry a sight of the documents attesting to, and enumerating some of the phenomena of “the incessant miracle of three years’ duration” may be obtained for a small fee. The record of the “miracles” bears the *imprimatur* of a Pope and several Cardinals, but it still lacks that of the Society for Psychic Research. The “Seven Angels” must be needing the latter badly, as without it their triumph will never be complete. Let us hope that the learned Spookical Researchers will send their “smart boy” to Rome at an early day, and that the “blessed ones” may find at Cambridge—a Duca.

But what became of the “mystery names” so cautiously used and what of the new ones? First of all came the substitution of the name of Eudiel for one of the Kabalistic names. Just one hundred years later, all the seven names suddenly disappeared, by order of the Cardinal Albitius. In the old and venerable Church of *Santa Maria della Pieta* on the Piazza Colonna, the “miraculous” painting of the Seven Archangels may be still seen, but the names have been scratched out and the places repainted. *Sic transit gloria*. A little while after that the mass and vesper services of the “Seven” were once more eliminated from the missals used, notwithstanding that “they are quite distinct” from those of the “planetary Spirits” who used to help Bishop Adalbert. But as “the robe does not really make the monk.” so the change of names cannot prevent the individuals that had them from being the same as they were before. They are still worshipped and this is all that my article aims to prove.

Will this be denied? In that case I have to remind the readers that so late as in 1825, a Spanish grandee supported by the Archbishop of Palermo made an attempt before Leo XII for the simultaneous re-

establishment of *the service and names*. The Pope granted the Church service *but refused the permission to use the old names*.⁸

“This service, perfected and amplified by order of Paul IV. the minutes of which exist to this day at the *Vatican* and the *Minerva*, remained in force during the whole pontificate of Leo X.” The Jesuits were those who rejoiced the most at the resurrection of the old worship, in view of the prodigious help they received from it, as it ensured the success of their proselytising efforts in the Philippine Islands. Pope Pius V conceded the same “divine service” to Spain, saying in his Bull, that “one could never exalt too much *these seven Rectors* of the world, *figured by the SEVEN PLANETS*,” and that . . . “it looked consoling and augured well for this century, that by the grace of God, the cult of *these seven ardent lights*, and these *seven stars*, was regaining all its lustre in the Christian republic.”⁹

The same “holy Pope permitted moreover to the nuns of *Matri-tensis* to establish the *fete* of JEHUDIEL the patron of their convent.” Whether another less pagan name has now been substituted for it we are not informed—nor does it in the least matter.

In 1832 the same demand in a petition to spread the worship of the “Seven Spirits of God,” was reiterated, endorsed this time by *eighty-seven bishops* and thousands of officials with high-sounding names in the Church of Rome. Again, in 1858, Cardinal Patrizzi and King Ferdinand II in the name of *all the people of Italy* reiterated their petition; and again, finally, in 1862. Thus, the Church services in honour of the seven “Spirit-Stars” have never been abrogated since 1825. To this day they are in full vigour in Palermo, in Spain, and even in Rome at “St. Mary of the Angels” and the “*Gesu*”—though entirely suppressed everywhere else; all this “because of Adalbert’s *heresy*,” de Mirville and the other supporters of Star-Angel worship are pleased to say. In reality there is no reason but the one already disclosed for it. Even the seven substitutes, especially the last four, have been too openly connected with black magic and astrology.

⁸ This is quoted from the volumes of the Marquis de Mirville’s “*Pneumatologie des Esprits*,” Vol. II, p. 388. A more rabid papist and ultramontane having never existed, his testimony can hardly be suspected. He seems to glory in this idolatry and is loud in demanding its public and universal restoration.

⁹ p. 358 *ibid*. Vide *infra*.

Writers of the de Mirville type are in despair. Not daring to blame the Church, they vent their wrath upon the old Alchemists and Rosicrucians. They clamour for the restitution of a public worship notwithstanding; and the imposing association formed since 1862 in Italy, Bavaria, Spain and elsewhere for the re-establishment of the cult of the Seven Spirits *in all its fullness* and in all Catholic Europe, gives hope that in a few years more the Seven Rishis of India now happily domiciled in the constellation of the Great Bear will become by the grace and will of some infallible Pontiff of Rome the legal and honoured divine patrons of Christendom.

And why not, since (St.) George is to this day, “the patron Saint of not only Holy Russia, Protestant Germany, fairy Venice, but also of merry England, whose soldiers,”—says W. M. Braith-waite,¹⁰—“would uphold his prestige with their heart’s blood.” And surely our “Seven gods” cannot be worse than was the rascally George of Cappadocia during his lifetime!

Hence, with the courage of true believers, the Christian defenders of the Seven Star-Angels deny nothing, at any rate they keep silent whenever accused of rendering divine honours to Chaldean and other gods. They even admit the identity and proudly confess to the charge of star-worshipping. The accusation has been thrown many a time by the French Academicians into the teeth of their late leader, the Marquis de Mirville, and this is what he writes in reply:

“We are accused of mistaking stars for angels. The charge is acquiring such a wide notoriety that we are forced to answer it very seriously. It is impossible that we should try to dissimulate it without failing in frankness and courage, since this *pretended mistake* is repeated incessantly in the Scriptures as in our theology. We shall examine . . . this opinion hitherto so accredited, today discredited, and which attributes rightly to our SEVEN PRINCIPAL SPIRITS the rulership, not of the seven known planets, with which we are reproached, but of the seven PRINCIPAL planets¹¹—which is quite a different thing.”¹²

¹⁰ “St. George for Merry England,” by W. M. Braithwaite. Masonic Monthly, No. 2.

¹¹ These “principal planets” are the mystery planets of the pagan initiates, but travestied by dogma and priestcraft.

¹² Pneumatologie des Esprits, Vol. II. Memoire adresse aux Academies, p. 359 et seq.

And the author hastens to cite the authority of Babinet, the astronomer, who sought to prove in an able article of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (May, 1885), that in reality besides the earth we had only SEVEN big planets.

The “seven *principal* planets” is another confession to the acceptance of a purely occult tenet. Every planet according to the esoteric doctrine is in its composition a *Septenary* like man, in its principles. That is to say, *the visible planet is the physical body* of the sidereal being the *Atma* or Spirit of which is the Angel, or Rishi, or Dhyan-Chohan, or Deva, or whatever we call it. This belief as the occultists will see (read in *Esoteric Buddhism* about the constitution of the planets) is thoroughly occult. It is a tenet of the Secret Doctrine—*minus* its idolatrous element—pure and simple. As taught in the Church and her rituals, however, and especially, as *practised*, it is ASTROLATRY as pure and as simple.

There is no need to show here the difference between teaching, or theory, and practice in the holy Roman Catholic Church. The words “Jesuit” and “Jesuitism” cover the whole ground. The Spirit of Truth has departed ages ago—if it has ever been near it—from the Church of Rome. At this, the Protestant Church, so full of brotherly spirit and love for her sister Church, will say, *Amen* The Dissenter, whose heart is as full of the love of Jesus as of hatred towards Ritualism and its mother Popery, will chuckle.

In the editorial of the *Times* for November 7, 1866, stands “A Terrible Indictment” against the Protestants, which says:

Under the influence of the Episcopal Bench, all the studies connected with theology have withered, until English Biblical critics are the scorn of foreign scholars. Whenever we take up the work of a theologian who is likely to be a Dean or a Bishop, we find, *not* an earnest inquirer setting forth the results of *honest research*, but merely an advocate, who, we can perceive, has begun his work with the fixed determination of *proving black white* in favour of his own traditional system.

If the Protestants do not recognize the “Seven Angels,” nor, while refusing them divine worship, do they feel ashamed and afraid of their names, as the Roman Catholics do, on the other hand they are guilty of “Jesuitism” of another kind, just as bad. For, while professing

to believe the Scriptures a direct *Revelation* from God, not one sentence of which should be altered under the penalty of eternal damnation, they yet tremble and cower before the discoveries of science, and try to pander to their great enemy. Geology, Anthropology, Ethnology and Astronomy, are to them what Uriel, Scaltiel, Jehudiel and Barachiel are to the Roman Catholic Church. It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. And since neither one nor the other of the two religions will abstain from anathematizing, slandering and persecuting Magic, Occultism, and even Theosophy, it is but just and proper that in their turn the Students of the Sacred Science of old should retort at last, and keep on telling the truth fearlessly to the faces of both.

MAGNA EST VERITAS ET PREVALEBIT

H. P. B.

Theosophist, June 1881

STARS AND NUMBERS

ANCIENT civilization saw nothing absurd in the claims of astrology, no more than many an educated and thoroughly scientific man sees in it today. Judicial astrology, by which the fate and acts of men and nations might be foreknown, [hardly] appeared, nor does it even now appear, any more unphilosophical or unscientific than does natural astrology or astronomy—by which the events of so-called brute and inanimate nature (changes of weather, &c), might be predicted. For it was not even prophetic insight that was claimed by the votaries of that abstruse and really grand science, but simply a great proficiency in that method of procedure which allows the astrologer to foresee certain events in the life of a man by the position of the planets at the time of his birth.

Once the probability, or even the simple possibility, of an occult influence exercised by the stars upon the destiny of man admitted—and why should the fact appear more improbable in the case of stars and man than in that of the sun-spots and potatoes?—and astrology becomes no less an exact science than astronomy. The earth, Prof. Balfour Stewart, F.R.S., tells us—“is very seriously affected by what takes place in the sun” . . . a connection “is strongly suspected between epidemics and the appearance of the sun’s surface.”¹

And if, as that man of science tells us, “a connection of some mysterious kind between the sun and the earth *is more than suspected*” . . . and the problem is a most important one “to solve,”

¹ One of the best known vegetable epidemics is that of the potatoe disease. The years 1846, 1860, and 1872 were bad years for the potatoe disease, and those years are not very far from the years of maximum sun-spots. . . there is a curious connection between these diseases affecting plants and the state of the sun. . . . A disease that took place about three centuries since, of a periodical and very violent character, called the “sweating sickness” . . . took place about the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century . . . and this is exactly the sun-spot period. . . . (The Sun and the Earth, Lecture by Prof. Balfour Stewart).

how much more important the solution of that other mystery—the undoubted affinity between man and the stars—an affinity believed in for countless ages and by the most learned among men! Surely the destiny of man deserves as much consideration as that of a turnip or a potatoe . . . And if a disease of the latter may be *scientifically* foretold whenever that vegetable crops out during a “sun-spot period,” why should not a life of disease, or health, of natural or violent death be as *scientifically* prognosticated by the position and appearance of the constellation with which man is as directly connected and which bears the same relation to him as the sun bears to the earth?

In its days, astrology was greatly honoured, for when in able hands it was often shown to be as precise and trustworthy in its predictions as astronomical predictions are in our own age. Omens were studied by all imperial Rome, as much, if not more than they are now in India. Tiberius practised the science; and the Saracens in Spain held star-divination in the greatest reverence, astrology passing into Western Europe through these, our first civilizers. Alphonso, the wise king of Castile and Leon, made himself famous in the thirteenth century by his “Astrological Tables” (called Alphonsine) ; and his code of the *Siata Purtidas*; and the great astronomer Kepler in the seventeenth, the discoverer of the three great laws of planetary motions (known as Kepler’s laws) believed in and proclaimed astrology a *true science*. Kepler, the Emperor Rudolph’s mathematician, he to whom Newton is indebted for all his subsequent discoveries, is the author of the “Principles of Astrology” in which he proves the power of certain harmonious configurations of suitable planets *to control human impulses*. In his official capacity of Imperial astronomer, he is *historically* known to have predicted to Wallenstein, from the position of the stars, the issue of the war in which that unfortunate general was then engaged. No less than himself, his friend, protector and instructor, the great astronomer Tycho de Brahe, believed in, and expanded, the astrological system. He was forced, moreover, to admit the influence of the constellations on terrestrial life and actions quite against his will or wish, and merely because of the constant verification of *facts*.

Closely related to astrology is the *Kabala* and its system of *numerals*. The secret wisdom of the ancient Chaldees left by them as an inheritance to the Jews relates primarily to the mythological science of the heavens and contains the doctrines of the hidden or occult wisdom concerning the cycles of time. In the ancient philosophy, the sacredness of numbers began with the great FIRST, the ONE, and ended with the naught or Zero, the symbol of the infinite and boundless circle, which represents the universe. All the intervening figures, in whatever combination, or however multiplied, represent philosophical ideas relating either to a moral or a physical fact in nature. They are the key to the archaic views on cosmogony, in its broad sense, including man and beings, and relate to the human race and individuals spiritually as well as physically. “The numerals of Pythagoras,” says Porphyry, “were hieroglyphical symbols, by means whereof he explained *all* ideas concerning the nature of all things” (*De Vita Pythag.*). In the symbolical *kabala*—the most ancient system left to us by the Chaldeans—the modes of examining letters, words and sentences for hidden meaning were numerical. The *gemantria* (one of the three modes) is purely arithmetical and mathematical, and consists in applying to the letters of a word the sense they bear *as numbers*—letters being used also for figures in the Hebrew as in Greek. Figurative Gemantria deduces mysterious interpretations from the shapes of letters used in occult manuscripts and the Bible.

Thus, as shown by Cornelius Agrippa, in *Numbers* (X. 35), the letter *Beth* means the reversal of enemies. The sacred anagrams known as Zeruph yield their mysterious sense by the second mode named *Themura*, and consists in displacing the letters and substituting them one for another and then arranging them in rows according to their numerical value. If, of all operations in the occult sciences there is not one that is not rooted in astrology, arithmetic and especially geometry are a part of the first principles of magic. The most recondite mysteries and powers in nature are made to yield to the power of numbers. And let this not be regarded as a fallacy. He who knows the relative and respective numbers or the so-called correspondence between causes and effects will alone be able to obtain of a certainty the desired result. A small mistake, a trifling difference in an

astronomical calculation and—no correct prediction of a heavenly phenomenon becomes possible. As Severinus Boethius puts it, it is by the proportion of certain numbers that all things were formed. “God geometrizes” saith Plato, meaning creative nature. If there are so many occult virtues in natural things, “what marvel if in numbers which are pure and commixed only with ideas, there should be found virtues greater and more occult?” asks Agrippa. Even Time must contain the mystery number; so also does motion, or action, and so, therefore, must all things that move, act, or are subjected to time. But “the mystery is in the abstract power of number, in its rational and formal state, not in the expression of it by the voice, as among people who buy and sell.” (*De Occulta Phil. sap.* iii. p. cii) The Pythagoreans claimed to discern many things in the numbers of names. And if those who having understanding were invited to “compute the number and name of the beast” by the author of St. John’s *Revelation* it is because that author was a Kabbalist.

The wisecracks of our generations raise daily! They cry that science and metaphysics are irreconcilable; and that it is but one more fallacy among the many flatteries uttered. The reign of exact science is proclaimed. On every use of Plato who is said to have turned to his imagination is sheered; while Aristotle’s method built on pure reason is the one accepted by Science. Why? Because it is the philosophical method of Plato that teaches the inverse of that of Aristotle. It starts with universals, the very existence of which is, “a matter of faith” says Dr. H. Draper, and from these it descended to particulars; or details. Aristotle, on the contrary, “rose from particular to universals, advancing to them by inductions” (*Conflicts between Religion and Science*). We humbly answer to this, that mathematics, the *ohly exact and infallible science* in the world of sciences—proceeds from UNIVERSALS.

It is this year especially, the year 1881, which seems to defy and challenge sober, matter-of-fact science, and by its extraordinary events *above*, as *below*, in heaven as upon earth, to invite criticism upon its strange “coincidences.” Its freaks in the domains of meteorology and geology were prognosticated by the astronomers, and these every

one is bound to respect. There is a certain triangle seen this year on the horizon formed of the most brilliant stars which was predicted by them, but none the less left unexplained. It is a simple geometrical combination of heavenly bodies, they say. As to that triangle, formed of the three large planets—Mentis; Jupiter and Saturn—Mars—to do with the destinies of either men or nations—why? that is pure superstition. “The mantle of the astrologers is burnt and the predictions of some of them, whenever verified, must be attributed to vain and blind chance.”

We are not so sure of that; and, if permitted, will further on tell why—meanwhile, we must remind the reader of the fact that Venus, the most intensely brilliant of the three above-named planets, as was remarked in Europe and for all we know in India also—suddenly parted company with its two companions and slowly moving onward, stopped above them, whence it goes on dazzling the inhabitants of the earth with an almost preternatural brilliancy.

The conjunction of *two* planets happens but rarely; that of three is still more rare; while the conjunction of four and five planets becomes an event. The latter phenomenon took place in historical times but once, 2449 years B.C., when it was observed by the Chinese astronomers and has not recurred since then. That extraordinary meeting of five large planets forebode all kinds of evils to the Celestial Empire and its peoples, and the panic then created by the predictions of the Chinese astrologers was not in vain. During the following 500 years, a series of internal broils, revolutions, wars, and changes of dynasty marked the end of the golden age of national felicity in the Empire founded by the great Fu-hi.

Another conjunction is known to have happened just before the beginning of the Christian era. In that year, three large planets had approached so closely together as to be mistaken by many for one single star of an immense size. Biblical scholars were more than once inclined to identify these “three in one” with the Trinity, and at the same [time] with the “star of the wise men of the East.” But they saw themselves thwarted in such pious desires by their hereditary enemies—the irreverent men of science, who proved that the astronomical conjunction took place a year before the period claimed

for the alleged birth of Jesus. Whether the phenomenon forbode good or evil is best answered by the subsequent history and development of Christianity, than which, no other religion cost so many human victims, shed such torrents of blood, nor brought the greater portion of humanity to suffer from what is now termed the “blessings of Christianity and civilization.”

The third conjunction took place in 1563 A. D. It appeared near the great nebula in the constellation of Cancer. There were three great planets and according to the astronomers of those days—the most nefarious: Mars, Jupiter and Saturn. The constellation of Cancer has always had a bad reputation; that year the mere fact of its having in its neighborhood a triune conjunction of evil stars, caused the astrologers to predict great and speedy disasters. These did come to pass. A terrible plague broke out and raged in all Europe, carrying off thousands upon thousands of victims.

And now, in 1881, we have again a visit of three other “Wanderers.” What do they forebode? Nothing good; and it would seem, as if of the great evils they are likely to pour on the devoted heads of hapless humanity, the fatal prelude is already being played. Let us enumerate and see how far we are from the truth. The nearly simultaneous and certainly in some cases unexpected deaths of great and the most remarkable men of our age. In the region of politics, we find the Emperor of Russia, Lord Beaconsfield, and Aga Khan;² in that of literature, Carlyle and George Eliot; in the world of art, Rubinstein, the greatest musical genius. In the domain of geology—earthquakes which have already destroyed the town of Casamicciola on the Island of Ischia, a village in California and the Island of Chio which was laid entirely waste by the terrible catastrophe—one, moreover, predicted for that very day by the astrologer Raphael. In the domain of wars,

² H. H. Aga Khan was one of the most remarkable men of the century. Of all the Mussulman, Shiahs or Soonis, who rejoice in the green turban, the Aga's claims to a direct descent from Mahomet through Ali rested on undeniable proofs. He again represented the historical “Assassins” of the Old Man of the Mountain. He had married a daughter of the late Shah of Persia; but political broils forced him to leave his native land and seek refuge with the British Government in India. In Bombay he had a numerous religious following. He was a high-spirited, generous man and a hero. The most noticeable feature of his life was that he was born in 1800—and died in 1881, at the age of 81. In his case too the occult influence of the year 1881 has asserted itself.

the hitherto invincible Great Britain was worsted at the Cape by a handful of Boers; Ireland is convulsed and threatens; a plague now rages in Mesopotamia; another war is preparing between Turkey and Greece; armies of Socialists and red-handed Nihilists obscure the sun of the political horizon in Europe; and the latter thrown into a violent perturbation is breathlessly awaiting the most unexpected events [in the] future—defying the perspicacity of the most acute of her political men. In the religious spheres the heavenly triangle pointed its double horn at the monastic congregations and—a general *exodus* of monks and nuns—headed by the children of Loyola, followed in France There is a revival of infidelity and mental rebellion, and with it a proportionate increase of missionary labourers (not labour), who like the hordes of Attila destroy much and build but little. Shall we add to the list of signs of these *nefasti dies*, the birth of the *New Dispensation* at Calcutta? The latter though having but a small and quite a local importance, shows yet a direct bearing upon our subject, *i.e.*, the astrological meaning of the planetary conjunction. Like Christianity with Jesus and his Apostles the *New Dispensation* can henceforth boast of having had a forerunner in starry heaven—the present triune conjunction of planets. It proves, moreover, our kabalistic theory of periodical cyclic recurrences of events. As the Roman sceptical world of 1881 years ago, we are startled by a fresh revival of mendicant Ebionites, fasting Essenes and Apostles upon whom descend “cloven tongues like as of fire,” and of whom we cannot even say as of the Jerusalem twelve, “that these men are full of new wine,” since their inspiration is entirely due to water, we are told.

The year 1-881, then, of which we have lived but one-third, promises, as predicted by astrologers and astronomers, a long and gloomy list of disasters on land, as on the seas. We have shown elsewhere (*Bombay Gazette*, March 30, 1881) how strange in every respect was the grouping of the figures of our present year, adding that another such combination will not happen in the Christian chronology before the year 11811, just 9,930 years hence, when—there will be no more a “Christian” chronology we are afraid, but something else. We said: “Our year 1881, offers that strange fact, that from whichever of four sides you look at its figures—from right

or left, from top or bottom, from the back, by holding the paper up to the light—or even *upside down*, you will always have before you the same mysterious and kabalistic numbers of 1881. It is the correct number of the three figures which have most perplexed mystics for over eighteen centuries. The year 1881, in short, is the number of the great Beast of the *Revelation*, the number 666 of St. John's *Apocalypsis*—that Kabalistic Book *par excellence*. See for yourselves: $1 + 8 + 8 + 1$ make eighteen; eighteen divided thrice gives three times six, or placed in a row, 666, “the number of man.”

This number has been for centuries the puzzle of Christendom and was interpreted in a thousand different ways. Newton himself worked for years over the problem, but, ignorant of the secret Kabala, failed. Before the Reformation it was generally supposed in the Church to have reference to the coming Antichrist. Since then the Protestants began to apply it in that spirit of Christian charity which so characterizes Calvinism to the Latin Popish Church, which they call the “Harlot,” the “great Beast” and the “scarlet woman,” and forthwith the latter returned the compliment in the same brotherly and friendly spirit. The supposition that it refers to the Roman nation—the Greek letters of the word *Latinus* as numerals, amounting to exactly 666—is absurd.

There are beliefs and traditions among the people which spring no one knows from whence and pass from one generation to the other, as an oral prophecy, and an unavoidable fact to come. One of such traditions, a correspondent of the *Moscow Gazette* happened to hear in 1874 from the mountaineers of the Tyrolian Alps, and subsequently from old people in Bohemia. “From the first day of 1876,” \ says that tradition, “a sad, heavy period will begin for the whole world *and will last for seven consecutive years*. The most unfortunate and fatal year for all will be 1881. He who will survive it, has an *iron head*.”

An interesting new combination, meanwhile, of the year 1881, in reference to the life of the murdered Czar, may be found in the following dates, every one of which marks a more or less important period in his life. It proves at all events what important and mysterious a part, the figures 1 and 8 played in his life. 1 and 8 make 18; and the

Emperor was born April 17 ($1 + 7 = 8$) in 1818. He died in 1881—the figures of the year of his birth and death being identical, and coinciding, moreover, with the date of his birth $17 = 1 + 7 = 8$. The figures of the years of the birth and death being thus the same, as four times 18 can be formed out of them, and the sum-total of each year's numerals is 18. The arrival at Petersburg of the late Empress—the Czar's bride—took place on September 8; their marriage April 16—($8 + 8 = 16$); their eldest daughter, the Grand Duchess Alexandra, was born August 18; the late Czarevitch Nicolas Alexandrovitch, on September the 8, 1843; ($1 + 8 + 4 + 3 = 16$, *i.e.*, twice 8). The present Czar, Alexander III, was born February 26, ($2 + 6 = 8$); the proclamation of the ascension to the throne of the late Emperor was signed February 18; the public proclamation about the Coronation day took place April 17 ($1 + 7 = 8$). His entrance into Moscow for the coronation was on August 17 ($1 + 7 = 8$); the Coronation itself being performed August 26 ($2 + 6 = 8$); the year of the liberation of the Serfs, 1861, whose numerals sum up 16—*i.e.*, twice 8!

To conclude, we may mention here a far more curious discovery made in relation, and as a supplement, to the above calculation, by a Jewish Rabbi in Russia—a Kabalist, evidently, from the use he makes of the *Gemantria* reckoning. It was just published in a St. Petersburg paper. The Hebrew letters as stated have all their numerical value or correspondence in arithmetical figures. The number 18 in the Hebrew Alphabet is represented by the letters—”HETH” = 8, and “JOD”=10. *i.e.*, 18. United together Heth and Jod form the word “khai,” or “Hai,” which literally translated means the imperative—*live* and *alive*. Every orthodox Jew during his fast and holy days is bound to donate for some pious purpose a sum of money consisting of, and containing the number 18 in it. So, for instance, he will give 18 copecks, or 18 ten copeck bits, 18 rubles or 18 times 18 copecks or rubles—according to his means and degree of religious fervour. Hence, the year 1818—that of the Emperor's birth—meant, if read in Hebrew—”khai, khai”—or *live, live*—pronounced emphatically twice; while the year 1881—that of his death read in the same way, yields the fatal words “Khai-tze” rendered in English, “*thou living one depart*”; or in other words, “life is ended.”

Of course, those sceptically inclined will remark that it is all due to blind chance and “coincidence.” Nor would we much insist upon the contrary, were such an observation to proceed but from uncompromising atheists, and materialists, who, denying the above, remain only logical in their disbelief, and have as much right to their opinion as we have to our own. But we cannot promise the same degree of indulgence whenever attacked by orthodox religionists. For, that class of persons while pooh-poohing speculative metaphysics, and even astrology—a system based upon strictly mathematical calculations, pertaining as much to exact science as biology or physiology, and open to experiment and verification—will, at the same time, firmly believe that potato disease, cholera, railway accidents, earthquakes and the like are all of *Divine origin* and, proceeding directly of God, have a meaning and a bearing on human life in its highest aspects. It is to the latter class of theists that we say: prove to us the existence of a *personal* God either outside or inside physical nature, demonstrate him to us as the external agent, the Ruler of the Universe; show him concerned in human affairs and destiny and exercising on them an influence, at least, as great, and reasonably probable as that exercised by the sun-spots upon the destiny of vegetables and then—laugh at us. Until then, and so long as no one is prepared with such a proof and solution, in the words of Tyndall—”Let us lower our heads, and acknowledge our ignorance, priest and philosopher, one and all.”