

Communications

Missing Material by H.P. Blavatsky Discovered: Part I

The Theosophy Company on their website describes H.P. Blavatsky's book titled *Transactions Of The Blavatsky Lodge* as follows:

In 1889, when H.P.B. was in London, the weekly meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge was devoted to the discussion of the archaic 'Stanzas' on which *The Secret Doctrine* is based. *Transactions* provides . . . H.P.B.'s answers to metaphysical and scientific questions, as stenographically reported, and afterwards revised by her for publication.

...

In an introductory note prefacing the original edition(s) of 1890/1891 of the *Transactions*, we find the following information:

The . . . *Transactions* are compiled from shorthand notes taken at the meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge of the Theosophical Society, from January 10th to June 20th, 1889, being somewhat condensed from the original discussions.

. . . the members of the 'B.L. of the T. S.' agreed to devote the debates of the weekly [Thursday] meetings to each stanza and sundry other metaphysical subjects.

The questions were put by members. . . . The answers in all cases are based on the shorthand Reports, and are those . . . as given by H. P. B. herself.

In H.P.B.'s magazine, *Lucifer*, it was noted in the October 15th, 1890 issue (p. 165), that the reports of the *Transactions* (covering the meetings of Jan. 10 through June 20, 1889) were transcribed in "twenty-four large long-hand folios."

Part I of the *Transactions* was published as a book in London in March 1890 and consisted of material discussed by H.P. Blavatsky at the following meetings:

Meeting 1. January 10, 1889 [Stanza I, sl. 1-2]

Meeting 2. January 17, 1889 [Stanza I, sl. 3-4]

Meeting 3. January 24, 1889 [Stanza I, sl. 5-8]

Meeting 4. January 31, 1889 [Stanza I, sl. 6-9; Stanza II, sl. 1-2]

Appendix on Dreams

Part II of the *Transactions* was published in January 1891 and consisted of material discussed by H.P. Blavatsky at the following meetings:

Meeting 5. February 7, 1889 [Stanza II, sl. 3-4]

Meeting 6. February 14, 1889 [Stanza III, sl. 1]

Meeting 7. February 21, 1889 [Stanza III, sl. 2-4]

Meeting 8. February 28, 1889 [Stanza III, sl. 5-8]

Meeting 9. March 7, 1889 [Stanza III, sl. 10-11]

Meeting 10. March 14, 1889 [Stanza IV, sl. 1-6]

In February, 1891, Alice Leighton Cleather wrote (*The Theosophist*, April 1891: 438): “The second part of the *Transactions*-Blavatsky Lodge, is now out, and the third [part] will shortly follow.”

H.P. Blavatsky died in May 1891 and Part III of the *Transactions* was never published.

It should be emphasized that the discussions in the published Parts I and II cover only the first four stanzas of Volume I of *The Secret Doctrine*. Part III would, no doubt, have contained Blavatsky’s additional comments on Stanza V and possibly even on Stanzas VI and VII.

What happened to the remaining unpublished Blavatsky material that was contained in the “twenty-four large longhand folios?” This unpublished material would have contained the discussions held with Blavatsky at Blavatsky Lodge meetings from March 21 to June 20, 1889. A total of 14 meetings!

Several years ago I discovered the whereabouts of the missing “large longhand folios.” Several of the folios are still missing but the majority survives. At one point I was allowed to peruse the extant folios and discovered that H.P. Blavatsky’s discussions and comments on Stanzas V and VI survive. Unfortunately, the folio containing her comments on Stanza VII did not survive the ravages of time and is still lost.

It is my sincere hope that the current “keeper” of the folios will soon permit Blavatsky’s unpublished valuable comments on Stanzas V and VI to be published for the benefit of all Blavatsky and Theosophical students throughout the world.

More in Part II.

Daniel H. Caldwell

Blavatsky Archives

<http://blavatskyarchives.com/introduction.htm>

* * *

A Response to Dan Merkur’s “Methodology and the Study of Western Spiritual Alchemy”

After a great deal of thought I have finally decided to respond¹ to the criticism of my work, which appeared in Dan Merkur’s “Methodology and the Study of Western Spiritual Alchemy” (*Theosophical History*, April 2000). On account of having labored long, hard and lovingly over both the articles he cites, in the end I found I could not remain silent, and while this response may not be enough to fully address his criticism I cannot help but try.

The focus of Merkur’s argument is by no means only my work. He starts by criticizing Mary Anne Atwood, saying that she began a pattern he views as unfortunate because it was she who proposed that spiritual alchemy was an “initiatory path” without having sufficient evidence, and notes that this idea was

Theosophical History



A Quarterly Journal of Research

Volume VIII, No. 9 July 2002

ISSN 0951-497X