

Jean Overton Fuller, Master Narayan and the Krishnamurti-Scott-Anrias Issue

By Govert Schuller

Abstract

[11] Jean Overton Fuller identified a Theosophical master, known by the name Narayan, with a yogi named Nagaratnaswami. This identification has consequences for the establishment of Narayan's age and the possibility of Narayan meeting the much younger Theosophist David Anrias, who claimed to have received from him some critical remarks on Krishnamurti. I gathered together most known claims made about this master by Theosophists. As a result it became clear that the identification of Narayan with Nagaratnaswami did not hold and it therefore invalidates Fuller's attempt to derive the age of Narayan from Nagaratnaswami, which would also invalidate her skepticism about a possible Narayan-Anrias connection.

I. Introduction

In this paper I would like to turn a critical gaze upon a subject that was addressed in two works by the late Theosophical scholar Jean Overton Fuller.¹ The subject is the Krishnamurti-Scott-Anrias issue—as I propose to name it—which she discusses in both her study of Cyril Scott, *Cyril Scott and A Hidden School: Towards The Peeling Of An Onion*, and in her biography of Krishnamurti's life, *Krishnamurti and the Wind: An Integral Biography*.² Obviously it is important for her—as it is for me—for in her monograph she starts and finishes with the subject and in the Krishnamurti biography she dedicated a special chapter to it, titled “Scott and Anrias: Wood and the Blind Rishi.”³

Before outlining my specific reasons for this somewhat narrow focus I would like to give a sketch of the context in which this focus will make sense. Jean

Overton Fuller and I found each other on opposite ends of our metaphysical evaluation of Krishnamurti. Though we both believe that Krishnamurti was intended to become an Avatar or World Teacher, she believed that Krishnamurti stayed with the program and eventually succeeded and I believe that Krishnamurti abrogated the project and went his own way. We specifically differ over a) the truth or falsity of the critical remarks about Krishnamurti written in the early 1930s by two Theosophically-minded⁴ writers, Cyril Scott and David Anrias, in their respective books *The Initiate in the Dark Cycle* and *Through the Eyes of the Masters*, and b) the fictional or real status of the Masters the two writers claimed to be in contact with and from whom they claimed to have received these critical statements.⁵ Her position was that Scott and Anrias were expressing serious misunderstandings of Krishnamurti's teachings and that the Mahatmic characters in their books [12] were fictional. My position is the opposite: Scott and Anrias were the chosen vehicles of the Masters to make their assessment of Krishnamurti known.⁶ Jean and I have read each other's studies and briefly corresponded about the issues, which I have posted on my web site with her kind permission.⁷ Clarity about such metaphysical positions is important for they obviously influence the choice of subject matter and formulation of hypotheses within the empirical realm.⁸ The better the metaphysical and the empirical spheres are understood and demarcated, the better our research.

My four specific aims in highlighting the Krishnamurti-Scott-Anrias issue are **a)** to critically examine Fuller's sources and facts, **b)** to analyze her overall reasoning

on this issue, **c)** to respond to a remark made by her in her Scott study about my own use of the Scott and Anrias material⁹ and **d)** to further the discussion on this important subject. In addition to that, as an unintended bonus in the year (2007) of Olcott's centennial, we will end with a deepened sense of the diverse claims about the Master with whom he considered himself most deeply affiliated.

Dismay. First, I would like to assuage Fuller's "dismay" over her perception that in *Krishnamurti and the World Teacher Project*¹⁰ I presented Scott's characters "Haig" and "Sir Thomas"— who made the most critical statements regarding Krishnamurti and whom she takes to be wholly fictional¹¹— "as though these were real people, of altogether superior understanding."¹² Though I personally believe that to be the case and might have been influenced by that conviction, I presented these characters with at least four caveats to maintain maximum neutrality. First, in the introduction, the question of the "ontological status and veracity of statements" in the case of quoting "Masters" was suspended.¹³ With this I meant that the explicit focus of my paper was on the Theosophical *perceptions* of Krishnamurti, regardless whether the characters to whom these views were attributed were real life persons, space brothers, Masters, impostors, fictional or imagined characters, fictionalized characters *a la* K. Paul Johnson, or delusional formations out of the unconscious, and regardless whether they were telling truths or falsehoods. Secondly, it was mentioned that many a person considers Scott's books as fiction, but also that Scott explicitly made the opposite claim, leaving in the middle who might be right.¹⁴ Thirdly, I put "Sir Thomas," within quotation marks indicating that he was not to be taken as a straightforwardly real person. Probably that should have been done so with

"Haig" and "Broadbent" and all other characters appearing in Scott's books as well. Meanwhile I did not want to load the text by overusing qualifiers like 'alleged' and 'according to' and all their variants, having some confidence in the reader that he or she will be able to make the relevant discriminations. Lastly, to indicate further awareness of the relevant difference, the conclusion called for the following: "Based on a historical, comparative study of the different Theosophical views on Krishnamurti as a preliminary and necessary work, it would be appropriate to develop a comprehensive Theosophical hypothesis about Krishnamurti."¹⁵ So, after having written the paper in as much a methodologically agnostic [13] mode as I was then capable of, I did release two pamphlets presenting my explicit Theosophical and partisan views regarding the metaphysical status of Krishnamurti and my own esoteric interpretation of the historical context, being quite aware of the different mode of discourse employed.¹⁶

Nevertheless, proper protocol in these cases of unverifiable communications from meta-empirical beings is still eluding me, though I am tending towards the formula "undetermined entity X made the documented statement Y *per* historical person Z," as I will do later in this paper for example by reporting that "Krishnamurti had 'cut himself adrift from the White Lodge' as claimed by 'Sir Thomas' *per* Scott." Believers can interpret the preposition *per* as literally meaning 'via' or 'through,' thereby leaving intact their belief in the reality of the entities that came 'through.' Skeptics can read it as 'according to' and regard the claim as conscious fraud or delusion. And phenomenologically-trained empiricists can read it neutrally and emphatically as a significant structural component of the lived, meaningful experience of the believer and author in question.¹⁷ The

latter, the phenomenological empiricists, do so by exercising methodological agnosticism, i.e. a radical suspension of judgement regarding the truth and value of such communications, which is not unlike—and partially inspired by—the Husserlian *epoché*.¹⁸ In that way researchers can attain an in-depth understanding of the meaning, structure and context of another's person's faith without getting sidetracked into a metaphysical discussion regarding its veracity and value, and hopefully being minimally blinded by their own explicit or implicit metaphysical convictions. I think this formula 'X stated Y *per* Z' befits the very complex nature of such claims, where in most cases both believers and skeptics are not in a position to deliver evidence beyond a shadow of a doubt and are mostly satisfied to stay within the bounds of their respective metaphysical paradigms and accept the particular conclusions generated thereby. Meanwhile, I will try not to blur the difference between scientific, philosophical and metaphysical modes of discourse and to be explicit when my own metaphysical convictions come into play.

Scott and Anrias. Now, let's focus on Fuller's chapter on Scott and Anrias. She gave her kind permission to have the relevant chapter available on the Internet and I am glad that she wrote it.¹⁹ I have been looking out for it since she announced in her paper on Cyril Scott to "go properly into the misunderstandings of Krishnamurti's teachings which they [Scott and Anrias] voice."²⁰ But, as her historically oriented paper was not the right venue to discuss at length Krishnamurtian and Theosophical teachings, I do not think this paper is either. I will, however, like her, make here and there some short remarks of a Theosophically metaphysical nature and will indicate them as such. A more elaborate treatment of this very important issue of the veracity of Scott's and Anrias'

criticisms of Krishnamurti will have to be presented in a separate study. What I will focus on is Fuller's more historically oriented research on the person whom Anrias claims to be his main Mahatmic instructor, the one he [14] called "the Rishi of the Nilgiri Hills," and who was alleged to be the same Master known to Blavatsky as Narayan. In this way this paper will add a little to the historical record and stay within the stated purpose of this journal.

The Reasoning. First I would like to present the structure of Fuller's argument regarding Narayan in her Krishnamurti biography. In her introductory statement she declares being "in doubt as to the relationship of Anrias with the adept." This opening is followed by an amalgamation of at least two different characters as the Rishi's identity (Tiravala, Narayan and Nagaratnaswami), a confusion of two different geographical locations 200 miles apart (Tiruvallam and the Nilgiri Hills), then focusing on one character named Nagaratnaswami—of whom "the most intimate portrait" is given by Theosophist Ernest Wood,²¹ and concluding that the sage had probably died of old age before Anrias came to India shortly after WWI. The clear implication, as I understand it, is that because of the Rishi's demise Anrias could not have met him; therefore, he could not have received the Rishi's criticisms of Krishnamurti and so had to have made them up, which would then add another nail to the coffin for burying these criticisms coming from Anrias. Meanwhile the argument would also take care of Scott's "sallies against Krishnamurti,"²² for Fuller thinks that Scott received those ideas from Anrias.²³ My counter-argument here is to show two, maybe three, defective links in her chain of reasoning with the objective of a) clearing the meta-empirical being Narayan from improbable identifications, b) clearing the historical persons Anrias

and Scott from unfounded accusations, c) strengthening the possibility, to be fully developed elsewhere, that the characters in Scott's and Anrias' books—such as “Justin Moreward Haig,” “Sir Thomas,” and the “Rishi of the Nilgiri Hills”—could well have been “camouflaged” living persons, perhaps even genuine members of the hierarchy of Theosophical Masters, and, last, but not least, d) making the pitch, also to be developed elsewhere, that the criticisms of Krishnamurti as presented by them are possibly from Mahatmic sources, and to be taken serious befitting their origin. I am aware that objectives a) and b) are probably acceptable as historical-empirical and that objectives c) and d) are purely metaphysical in nature and therefore not acceptable for most academics. As a fall back position I would restate objective c) more conservatively and state that Fuller has not proven that Scott's camouflaged characters are fictional and therefore are still undetermined, and I would restate objective d) by arguing that the criticisms of Krishnamurti coming from (or *through*) Scott and Anrias are intrinsically relevant in a Theosophical, philosophical and historical sense, regardless of their source, and should be properly deepened and contextualized to test their validity and also to enrich our empirical-historical understanding of Scott and Anrias in their roles as authors and actors within the Theosophical life-world.

II. Narayan / Jupiter / Agastya

While checking her sources and studying her argumentation strategy, I became increasingly intrigued about the identity, qualities and [15] residence of this alleged Mahatma. In Blavatsky's diary of 1878 he goes by the name of Narayan.²⁴ According to David Pratt, he is one of the few Masters “spared identification” by K. Paul Johnson.²⁵ The only research I found were paragraph-long notes by C. Jinarajadasa (1925 &

1945 [1919]), Josephine Ransom (1938), J.L. Davidge (1944), Geoffrey A. Barborka (1966), Boris de Zirkoff (1969) and Charles Ryan (1975).²⁶ All six make overlapping claims about Narayan with minimal argumentation and references. Though, as we'll see, many different names were used to refer to this sage I will for clarity's sake stick to the name Narayan as the primary reference name, for 1) most claims refer back to Blavatsky's experiences with this being, 2) she was the first to make any claims about him, and 3) she knew him by that name. Keep in mind that this paper is primarily an investigation of both Theosophical and Neo-Theosophical claims made about Narayan and not to establish his ontological status, about which I will try to be methodologically agnostic. How and why Fuller ends up mistakenly identifying Narayan with two Indian yogis named Tiravala and Nagaratnaswami will be the main focus of the third section of this paper. But before doing so I'll have to open a veritable Pandora's box of all the claims made about this Mahatmic character.

The Record. The list of names, incidents and sources Fuller presents as pertaining to one and the same Mahatma are the following seven. Note the different spellings of the little town Tiruvallam throughout this paper. I found six variations.²⁷ Its location is 8-10 miles northwest from Arcot, Tamil Nadu, 70 miles West from Madras. The spelling I will stick to, Tiruvallam, is the one used on different Indian and international Web sites. Note also the frequent mention of the Nilgiri Hills, which is ca. 260 miles South West from Madras, because of its importance later on in the paper. For completeness sake four more events or characters are added to the list.

Tiravālā. Name of a yogi whose portrait Blavatsky precipitated in 1877.²⁸ Olcott states that “the yogi's name was

always pronounced by H.P.B. ‘Tiravālā’, ...”²⁹ Olcott’s description of the portrait is as follows: “The yogi is depicted in *Samādhī*, the head drawn partly aside, the eyes profoundly introspective and dead to external things, the body seemingly that of an absent tenant.”³⁰ Note that the yogi is not necessarily blind, but in a state of deep meditation or even having an out-of-body-experience. Fuller believes this yogi is Narayan.

Tiruvalluvar. Name of a southern Indian poet and philosopher living somewhere during the first millennium, and author of the highly praised collection of maxims titled *Kural* or *Thirukural*.³¹ It is the name Olcott could “very well imagine that she meant,” when H.P.B. actually “always pronounced” it as the above Tiravālā. Olcott inferred from H.P.B. that the sage was still in embodiment, which would make him somewhere between a thousand and two thousand years old, of which improbable feat Olcott remarks that “to all save Hindus that would seem incredible.”³² Olcott also stated that the poet was considered in Southern India as one of the 18 Siddhas, still living in the Tirupati and Nilgiri Hills, “keeping watch and ward over [16] the Hindu religion.”³³ According to Blavatsky the Siddhas are both a hierarchy of Dhyan Chohans and a name for almost divine saints and sages.³⁴ As the class of Dhyan Chohans, “The highest gods, ... Archangels,”³⁵ is maybe a little too exalted for this sage to be a member of, Olcott might well be referring to the Theosophical idea of a planetary hierarchy of Masters, lead by the “Nameless One” or “the ‘Initiator,’”³⁶ named Sanat Kumara by both Leadbeater³⁷ and Bailey.³⁸ H.P.B. describes the latter only as “the most prominent of Kumaras” and is probably the same as Karttekiya, a Kumara with the title of Siddha-Sena, meaning “the leader of Siddhas.”³⁹ Olcott numbers the Siddhas as 18 and in Bailey’s diagram of the Planetary Hierarchy one can count 17

with “Jupiter” (i.e. Narayan; see below) as one of them.⁴⁰ Though these congruencies are interesting byways in this query, and can possibly shed some light on the identity and importance of the sage in question, it has to be kept in mind that this line of investigation was triggered by Olcott’s imagination—inspired or not—or more exact, his faculty of association, because of the similarity of the names Tiravālā and Tiruvalluvar.⁴¹

“... he of the ‘pencils’ and ‘Old Horse’ incidents”⁴² or, as Olcott called him in his autobiography, “The artistic Somebody.” This Master allegedly was one of Blavatsky’s “*Alter Egos*,” or overshadowing intelligences, involved in writing *Isis Unveiled* in the mid-1870s in New York. The pencil incident occurred when Olcott was reluctant to give up his pencil to Narayan (in the capacity of Blavatsky’s *Alter Ego*), who requested it, and the sage, clairvoyantly perceiving Olcott’s reluctance, rebuked the colonel by precipitating a “dozen pencils of the same make and quality.” The other incident was when Olcott thought he was addressing “my ‘chum’ H.P.B.” with a good-humored directive—“Well, Old Horse, let us get to work!”—while he was, to his shame, actually addressing the “the staid philosopher.” Of all Masters that Olcott claimed to have been involved with, this Master stands out as Olcott’s best friend, the one for whom he had “the most filial reverence” and who had “read to the bottom” of his heart. Olcott was told that he was from South India, a landed proprietor, and a “Teacher of Teachers.”⁴³ The latter title foreshadows the later claim that he was Mahatma Morya’s superior, which will be relevant later on in this paper. It was also possibly Narayan who was involved in last minute changes of the very first issue of *The Theosophist* in late September of 1879 in Mumbai (Bombay). De Zirkoff found in Olcott’s *Diaries* that on “Sept. 28th, Col. Olcott arose and went to see the printer at 5:30

A.M., to make some changes ordered by the 'revered Old Gentleman' the night before."⁴⁴ According to de Zirkoff, the title applied to Narayan. In the third volume of his autobiography Olcott recounts that H.P.B. and himself saw him physically present at a small reception she held when in Pondicherry, India, in September 1883, on her way from the Nilgiri Hills to Adyar.⁴⁵ The important details of this story will be discussed later on.

N- or Narayan (or his symbol/signature). Referred to as such in H.P.B.'s diary, which she kept in the last year, and especially the last months, of her stay in New [17] York in 1878.⁴⁶ H.P.B. reported in the diary that she was overshadowed a couple of times by him (the memorable one being the 'Old Horse incident') and that he was somehow involved in trying to provide Master Morya with samples of ore.⁴⁷ Olcott's assessment of the diary was that some of the Masters wrote some of its sentences, because of the different handwritings involved.⁴⁸ What is allegedly Narayan's symbol or signature can also be found a couple of times in the diary, the most notable occurring next to the dramatic exclamation "Consummatum est" ("It is accomplished") on the date of their departure. A facsimile reproduction of that page of H.P.B.'s diary is included in the first volume of *Blavatsky: Collected Writings*.⁴⁹ From the context it is clear that Narayan *per* Blavatsky was quite anxious for her and Olcott to leave the USA for India,⁵⁰ which is understandable for at least one Theosophical and some other more mundane reasons. If he was also the Mahatmic "Regent of India," as claimed later by Jinarajadasa,⁵¹ Bailey,⁵² Leadbeater⁵³ and Besant⁵⁴ then, Theosophically speaking, it could be argued, as Annie Besant did, that Narayan had some important plans for the two Westerners to shake up the continent in his care. Actually, towards the end of her life, Annie Besant

confessed that she herself had received "marching orders" in her struggle for Indian Home Rule from the sage. There was also the more mundane anxiety over the possibility that Olcott's ex-wife, Mary Morgan Olcott, could prevent Olcott from leaving the USA—with H.P.B. even fearing arrest—because of his financial obligations to her and their children.

Jupiter. Star name given to Narayan in Leadbeater's allegedly clairvoyant research into the past lives of Krishnamurti and other Theosophists and Masters. The bulk of these Neo-Theosophical visions was written down between 1910 and 1913, published serially in *The Theosophist* and bundled in the books *Man: Whence, How and Whither* (1913) and *The Lives of Alcyone* (1924).⁵⁵ In all he mentions about a dozen incarnations of Narayan, in which one finds him often connected to Mars (Morya), both oftentimes executing the directives of the founder of the "Fifth Root Race," the Manu. The earliest incarnation mentioned is about 77,000 years ago in the Arabian Peninsula, where he, with Mars, directed the affairs of a large group of settlers, who had come from the west, crossing the "Sahara Sea" and Egypt getting out of the way of "the catastrophe of 75,025 B.C." A part of that group makes it all the way to the shores of the "Gobi Sea," where Narayan has another five incarnations. During the last three of these, between 19,000 and 16,000 B.C., the Manu sends large groups to migrate to India every time under Mars' leadership with Narayan either as Mars' teacher, father or son. Then in 13,500 B.C. we find him as the Pharaoh of Egypt marrying his daughter off to Mars, who had come with a group from India for the "Aryanisation" of Egypt. His last six incarnations were divided between India (three times), Egypt (one more time) and Greece (twice). A couple of times he was king, related twice to Mizar (Nityananda) and once was the great-grandfather of

Alcyone (Krishnamurti). His last mentioned incarnation was around 1,500 B.C. in Greece, where he died young in order to get back to India.⁵⁶

During his own life, Leadbeater claims to [18] have met Narayan in the flesh together with T. Subba Row in 1885, and stated that he was residing “now” (1913) in the Nilgiri Hills. Leadbeater observed that this Master “holds Himself very upright and moves with alertness and military precision,” and that he is a “landed proprietor,” apparently being an employer of some sorts. He is a so-called First Ray Master specializing in esoteric chemistry and astronomy, i.e. alchemy and astrology, and is the “spiritual regent of India.”⁵⁷

Nagaratnaswami. A poor and blind yogi living next to Tiruvallam, about 70 miles West of Madras.⁵⁸ Theosophists Ernest Wood and his friend K. Narayanaswami Aiyar⁵⁹ visited him in 1910 motivated by Aiyar’s conviction that the yogi was none other than the great Master known by the star name “Jupiter.” In the same year Wood returned and stayed with him for a week and also came back for a one-day visit. On his second visit the yogi prophesied to him that he would become the teacher of someone who would later become a great teacher, which later Wood took to be a prophetic reference to Krishnamurti, whom he indeed taught and would later regard as “much more deep-sighted” than either Leadbeater or Besant.⁶⁰ On this visit the yogi also told Wood that in a former life Wood had been his father and a king, and that he, the yogi, after inheriting the throne from Wood, abused his wealth and power, which was the reason for his present poverty and blindness.⁶¹ Note here that the yogi’s blindness was highly probable a condition with which he was born because of allegedly karmic causes and not acquired in later life because of old age, though that cannot be entirely excluded. On his third visit the yogi told

Wood that a misunderstanding existed among some Theosophists regarding his relationship with a “Sitaram Bhavaji.” This person, the yogi insisted, was his own Master as well as the Master of Blavatsky, Olcott and also Wood, and was not his disciple as some Theosophists thought, an issue that will be addressed later in this paper. This Master, together with a Kashmiri Master, had visited him a long time ago. The yogi had subsequently “seen him and been instructed by him clairvoyantly.” From the context it is clear that here we are dealing with the Masters Morya and Koot Hoomi, which is further analyzed by Fuller in three long interesting paragraphs.⁶² The yogi also told Wood that both Blavatsky and Olcott had visited him and that a greater Master than the last two lived somewhere in the mountains north of Tiruvallam.⁶³

The Rishi of the Nilgiri Hills. In Cyril Scott’s biographical material on his friend David Anrias (a pseudonym for Brian Ross) the following claims are made regarding Anrias’ relationship with the sage.⁶⁴ After serving in the British military during World War I Anrias left for India and stayed there for seven years till 1927. In India he would often spend time in the Nilgiri Hills, where he would practice meditation and was able to mentally tune in to “The Rishi of the Nilgiri Hills,” who resided there. In the message allegedly from the Rishi himself it was stated that it “was I who caused you to be led to India and to live for several years within the aura of my *ashrama*.”⁶⁵ The Rishi instructed him in meditation and esoteric astrology. The first skill [19] made it possible for Anrias to receive messages from Masters regardless of distance, which was allegedly put to use in writing the 1932 book *Through the Eyes of the Masters*, containing pencil drawings of, and messages from, different Masters. The second skill he used to pepper his writings with a plethora of astrological

analyses. According to Scott the Rishi had urged Anrias “to publish some astrological prognostications in *The Theosophist*,” where they indeed appeared in several issues in 1921, co-authored with the eminent American Theosophist Fritz Kunz.⁶⁶

Though never using his name, it is obvious that Scott means that the Rishi is the same as Narayan for the following reasons. First he refers to the Rishi as “the Master Madame Blavatsky quaintly refers to as the Old Gentleman of the Nilgiri Hills,”⁶⁷ which is not entirely correct as Blavatsky indeed refers to Narayan as the “Old Gentleman,”⁶⁸ but never connects him with the Nilgiri Hills, which is only done later by Leadbeater. Secondly the Rishi is an adept of esoteric astrology, echoing Olcott’s claim that Narayan had transferred to him some insights regarding “cosmic cycles” and “stellar [sic] constellations.”⁶⁹ Lastly, Scott refers to him as “Master Jupiter,”⁷⁰ tying him with Leadbeater’s writings, where Narayan is known as “Jupiter” *tout court*.

More. Though Fuller doesn’t mention them, four more characters or events should be added to the list in order to complete it as far as the different aliases Narayan is supposed to be known by, and for the purpose of increasing the possibility of finding a solution to the identity conundrum caused by the amalgamation of all these characters. To top it all off, the two Mahatma letters attributed to Narayan, both addressed to Olcott, will also receive some attention.

“One of the Hindu Founders of the Parent Theosophical Society.” In the June 1882 issue of *The Theosophist* a letter was published containing some important and critical observations regarding the Theosophical Society’s erstwhile ally, the Arya Samaj, which had suddenly made a *volte-face* regarding the *bona fide* status of the TS. The letter was dated “Tiruvallam Hills, May 17” and

signed “One of the Hindu Founders of the Parent Theosophical Society.”⁷¹ Before analyzing the anomaly of the place name (see the paragraph on the geographical conundrum) and the claimed status of the signatory, the whereabouts of H.P.B. and Olcott in the spring of 1882 might be of relevance. If the date of the letter is correct than the letter was written a couple of weeks after H.P.B., Olcott and a party of Theosophists, including Subba Row, visited Tiruvallam from Madras (now Chennai) on April 30 1882, where they just had inaugurated the new Madras branch. According to Theosophist Soobiah Chetty, who was included in the party, the intention of the visit was “to pay respect to the Master who lived somewhere near this village.” Who told him so, he does not mention, but he does state that it was Olcott who told a group of new applicants to membership three days earlier that “within a hundred miles of Madras, there lived One of this august Fraternity,” i.e. “the Great White Lodge.” Unfortunately the meeting doesn’t happen and Chetty reports the rumor that only H.P.B. and [20] Subba Row succeeded in seeing the Master, but not Olcott.⁷² The trip is also mentioned by Olcott, according to whom its objective was the visit of an old temple and its sanctuary, which event was cut short by the exorbitant bonus demanded by the “sordid Brahmins in charge.”⁷³ Though not mentioning any Masters, he did write that Tiruvellum once used to be “a very holy place, owing to the great souls who lived—and some still live, as it is alleged—there.”⁷⁴ So we have here some slightly contradictory stories of a possible meeting with a Mahatma in the physical realm of Tiruvallam and an important letter received from the “Tiruvallam Hills” a couple of weeks later from someone making the grand claim of being “One of the Hindu Founders of the Parent Theosophical Society.” Whether the writer of the letter could be identified as Narayan depends on accepting the following two circumstantial hypotheticals:

If different Mahatmas were involved in the founding of the TS—Morya being the most prominent one—Narayan could be one of them. If Narayan was involved in writing *Isis Unveiled*, which process started even before the TS was founded, then he was at least ‘around’ during its founding. *Ergo* he could have been one of its Hindu founders, though under deep cover. As far as motive is concerned in writing the letter, one can imagine the indignation felt by a Hindu deeply involved in the TS for the “bewildering ... contradictions,” a “startling accusation” and a “fatuous oversight” coming from those considered previously as friends and allies in the cause of spreading the “Wisdom-Religion.”⁷⁵ Finally, the conclusion that the adept possibly met by H.P.B. in Tiruvallam and the writer of the letter signing “Tiruvallam Hills” were one and the same seems to be obvious because of the similarity of place names. First Jinarajadasa, then Ransom and de Zirkoff, make that claim without further back up.⁷⁶

The Tiravellum Mahatma. On a few occasions it seems that both Blavatsky and Olcott refer to Narayan as the “Tiravellum Mahatma” (Blavatsky) or the “Mahatma at Tirivellum” (Olcott). Both do so in the context of a series of answers (the “Replies”) Blavatsky received, in the summer of 1883 while residing in the Nilgiri Hills, from her *Alter Egos* to questions posed by an English member of the TS.⁷⁷ In the case of Olcott only a few logical steps have to be taken to establish with a reasonable degree of confidence the identification. In a February 1885 letter to his friend Francesca Arundale—in a story about a “Mahatma at Tirivellum” intervening in Blavatsky’s health to save her life—Olcott made it clear in parentheses that he meant the Master who had dictated the “Replies,” and to whom he was very close.⁷⁸ In his autobiography he states that the one dictating the “Replies”

through Blavatsky was his favorite Master, the “artistic Somebody,” the one whom he had called by accident “Old Horse.”⁷⁹ According to Blavatsky, to finish the chain of reasoning, this was none other than Narayan.⁸⁰ In the case of Blavatsky it gets quite complicated, maybe even impossible, to make the identification. With her the trail starts in a fall 1883 letter to A.P. Sinnett in which she refers to “a sentence written by the Tiravellum Mahatma in *Reply* no. 2.”⁸¹ From the context it does not become clear whom she meant and de Zirkoff, [21] neither in his notes on Narayan nor in his notes on the “Replies,” makes a connection between the two.⁸² He does quote the relevant passage from the just mentioned Olcott letter to Ms. Arundale, but doesn’t execute the steps as done above, nor even hints at it. It is quite possible that de Zirkoff doesn’t make the connection because a statement by Blavatsky prevents him, or anybody else, of doing so, because in a letter from Blavatsky to Sinnett she stated regarding the authorship of the “Replies” that they were “written half by M., half by either chelas or handwritings that I see for the first time,” which would be hard for her to write if Narayan, whose handwriting she should have been very familiar with from writing *Isis Unveiled*, was involved.⁸³ A couple of months later she writes Sinnett “It is my Boss and two others you don’t know” who were involved, more or less hinting that they were Mahatmas like her “Boss” Morya. This was echoed the following year by T. Subba Row, stating in a pamphlet that the “‘Replies’—as every one in our society is aware of—were written by three ‘adepts.’”⁸⁴ Blavatsky added a footnote to this text from which it becomes clear that she endorsed this statement. The only other useful information coming from Subba Row regarding this same Mahatma as the one whom Blavatsky referred to as the “Tiravellum Mahatma,” was that he resided in Southern India. Some might

have interpreted this as the telltale sign indicating Narayan, premised on the idea that there would be only one Master living there. Subba Row would not necessarily agree with this conclusion for he explicitly made the claim in 1889 that “at the present day there are high adepts and schools of occultism in Southern India” indicating multiple candidates.⁸⁵ In conclusion, we have here some contradictions regarding the authorship of the “Replies”—between Blavatsky and Olcott and between different positions of Blavatsky herself—for which there seems no easy solution.

The author of letters 54 and 24 in *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom (in two Series)*. The eminent Theosophist and former T.S. President C. Jinarajadasa transcribed and published the two only pieces of writing attributed to Narayan. Just to get a flavor of the sage’s thoughts and relationship to Olcott, and because both are quite brief, they will be reproduced in full. The first one, Letter 54 in the *First Series*, is not so much a letter, but some remarks by the sage added in August 1877, by allegedly occult means, to an already existing letter while in transit. Its recipient was Olcott and its writer was Emily Kislingbury, a recent TS member, “secretary of the British National Association of Spiritualists of London” and later member of Blavatsky’s “Inner Group.”⁸⁶

She is a sweet,
truthful, sincere nature.
Would to heavenly
powers there were a few
more like her in London.
Teach her and take care
of her.

[Signature in
unknown script]
Tell her I was
several times with her at
the Hdqrs.

Jinarajadasa identifies Letter 54 as coming from Narayan because of the similar handwriting as Letter 24 (in the *Second Series*), which Blavatsky identified as Narayan’s, though [22] the signatures “in unknown script” are not the same.

The second piece of correspondence—this one a short letter—was written in red pencil and Blavatsky added in blue pencil the remark “the old gentleman your Narayan.” Jinarajadasa did not know the particulars of the situation referred to in the letter, nor mentions to whom the letter was addressed.⁸⁷ Later, in a 1934 article in *The Theosophist*, he stated that Olcott was the recipient.⁸⁸ Barborka also states that the addressee was Olcott and assumed from the context that he received the letter somewhere in 1875 before the founding of the TS.⁸⁹ I think both are right about its addressee being Olcott and would support this with the reasoning that it makes sense to understand the possessive adjective “your” as a reference to Olcott, expressing H.P.B.’s understanding of the close relationship Olcott had with Narayan.

You may—and ought to
be—kind to and lenient with an
insane person. But not even for
the sake of such a kindness
have you the right to keep back
your religion, and allow him
even for one twinkling of the
eye to believe you are a
Christian or that you may be
one.

You have to make once
for ever your choice - either
your duty to the Lodge or your
own personal ideas.

[Signature in script]
“(the old gentleman your
Narayan)”

Rishi Agastya. In Blavatsky's *Theosophical Glossary* Theosophists might have learned the following information about this legendary seer in Vedic literature: "Agastya (*Sk.*). The name of a great Rishi, much revered in Southern India; the reputed author of hymns in the *Rig Veda*, and a great hero in the *Râmâyana*. In Tamil literature he is credited with having been the first instructor of the Dravidians in science, religion and philosophy. It is also the name of the star 'Canopus'."⁹⁰ Otherwise in her extensive *oeuvre* she only mentions him a few times, once stating in an 1883 article for *The Theosophist* that he was one of the "great adepts."⁹¹ In the supplement of the same issue the prominent Theosophist Damodar Mavalankar stated that he now lives as a Dhyān Chohan, i.e. a very high disembodied adept.

Many years later, in November 1929 just after Krishnamurti's dramatic dissolution of the Order of the Star, Annie Besant made some remarkable statements about her professed relationship with this ancient seer and about his status in the hierarchy of Theosophical masters: "It was in 1913 that I first came into direct conscious touch with the Rshi [sic] Agastya, the Regent of India in the Inner Government."⁹² The apparent rationale for revealing this relationship was to buttress her "two sides, one coin" position, trying to bridge the differences between herself and Krishnamurti, with she herself working under Agastya and the Manu ("the ruler") in one department of the Theosophical hierarchy and Krishnamurti working under the Bodhisattva Maitreya ("the teacher") in another.

Because Besant titled Agastya "Regent of India"—a position that earlier in that decade had been assigned to Narayan by both Bailey [23] (1922) and Leadbeater (1925)—her claim has to be investigated for this study. From Besant's

two articles revealing the esoteric motivations of her political activism and an article by Jinarajadasa titled "Dr. Besant's Occult Life" one can reconstruct the following.⁹³ Between 1909 and 1915 she had received requests and instructions from the Rishi Agastya and the "King" of the "Inner Government," Sanat Kumara, to start campaigning for India's freedom and to try to reform some of its "wrong social customs" like child marriages. From late 1913 on she became very active by lecturing, publishing, starting the weekly *The Commonwealth*, and even purchasing the Anglo-Indian daily newspaper, the *Madras Standard*, renamed *New India*. All these actions served to influence Indian politics and social life. They resulted in her internment (in the Nilgiri Hills!), in her presidency of the Indian National Congress, and in tactical disagreements with Gandhi.⁹⁴ Her 1915 encounter with the "King" was for her apparently the most dramatic event. According to Jinarajadasa she kept the written instructions, which she called her "Marching Orders," in her handbag "all the time thereafter,"⁹⁵ and Nethercot contends of that meeting that "the vision of it controlled the rest of Annie Besant's life."⁹⁶ One of its instructions—to bring Agastya back into the picture—was for her to "[r]emember that you represent in the outer world the Regent, who is my agent."⁹⁷ For the Rishi she claimed that he was somehow involved in the University Act of 1904⁹⁸ and "permitted the writing and circulation" of the controversial 1927 book *Mother India* by Katherine Mayo, which described many questionable Indian practices.⁹⁹ Many Indians resented both events, but *per* Besant the Rishi's rationale was to stir, provoke and stimulate his "sluggish, indifferent" people to action.

The open question now is whether Besant was aware, or even intended, that, if she referred to Agastya as the "Regent of India," she was also implicitly

making a connection to Narayan. The record is pretty thin to make the case. It is actually so thin that people could regard them as two different masters as Nethercot did when he presumed that in Theosophy's pantheon Jupiter (Narayan) ruled under Agastya.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore the explicit claims by Ransom (1938)¹⁰¹, Davidge (1944) and Jinarajadasa (1945)¹⁰² that they were to be considered one and the same master were made after her death and therefore were never able to be confirmed by her. Only one hint could be found connecting Agastya with Narayan that Besant could have been, or should have been, aware of, and that is in an article about Agastya in the book *Our Elder Brethren* of which she was the editor. In the article its author Helen Veale stated that the "Mahâ-Rishi" Agstya's home "to-day" (1934) was in "the Nilgiris," echoing the claims made by Leadbeater (1913), Bailey (1922) and Anrias (1932) regarding Narayan's residence.¹⁰³ Did she read this geographical reference, being the editor, and did she let it stand for she believed it to be true for Narayan, and therefore also for Agastya, for she believed them to be the same person? If so, the next question would be about her reason to downplay the connection. It might have been to insulate her political work—which, according to Leadbeater's biographer Tillet, was the only project then in her life not dominated by Leadbeater—from her somewhat [24] disapproving friend and co-worker. He had quite a different, more conservative, view on politics, claimed to have met Jupiter in in bodily form and claimed to be on speaking terms with most of the hierarchy and therefore able to change the instructions she believed to have received.¹⁰⁴

Even if the Agastya-Narayan connection might have been thin in Besant's writings, not so with her successor as president of the Theosophical Society George Arundale, whose political views were in line with

hers. He had been detained with her in 1917, during which time she might have shared her visions of, and instructions from, her masters. He edited the June and July 1944 issues of *The Theosophist* with many articles about India's "Spiritual Regent," "Mighty Guardians" and "National Deva," and probably penned the long introductory editorial about India's rightful place in the family of nations with the aim "to help India to be ready with a united front when the time comes for her presence at the world Peace Conference."¹⁰⁵ J.L. Davidge's contribution to the issue was an article about Agastya in which he detailed the legendary and historical information about him and under the heading "His work for India Today" enumerated most of the claims about Narayan/Jupiter/Agastya made earlier by Blavatsky, Olcott, Besant and Leadbeater, making the case very clear that he regarded all the claims as pertaining to one and the same person.¹⁰⁶ The articles and editorial taken together indubitably paint a picture of Theosophy as claiming a superior insight into the history and destiny of India and having had privileged access to some of its most important meta-empirical movers and shakers. As such it can be seen as one more attempt by a prominent Theosophist through editorial authority to strategically insert some metaphysical claims and political directives into India's struggle for independence.

III. The Weak Links

After having fleshed out, so to speak, the many claims about Narayan the stage is set for a closer look at Fuller's claim that both Tiravala and Nagaratnaswami are identical with Narayan by comparing some of their characteristics like their eyesight, bearing, language, guru-status, residence and age. The section on the sage's possible residences will be relatively long but will deepen one's sense of time and place regarding the

whole issue. But first a more Theosophical consideration.

Theosophical. One weak link in Fuller's claim is of a Theosophical kind, and as this might not fly with any positivist-reductionist historians, I will make my point short and in the form of a question: If Narayan is to be identified with Nagaratnaswami, and if this Adept is as important as Blavatsky, Olcott and Leadbeater thought him to be, and if adepts are claimed to have longevity¹⁰⁷ and even non-physical continuance,¹⁰⁸ is it Theosophically conceivable that a Mahatma of such stature just dies of old age and therefore not be able to communicate anymore?

Eyesight. The second weak link, and here we land back into the physical, pertains to eyesight. The problem here is that Fuller thinks that both H.P.B.'s 1877 blind Tiravālā and Wood's 1910 blind Nagaratnaswami are [25] the same person as Narayan, while *forgetting* Olcott's claim that H.P.B. and he saw Narayan in Pondicherry between those years, i.e. September 1883, when the sage was definitely not visually challenged.¹⁰⁹ When Olcott recognized him at a little reception at H.P.B.'s lodgings and wanted to approach him, the sage's "eyes expressed the command" that he should not. I use the verb *forget* intentionally, because Fuller in her study of Blavatsky and her teachers did mention this meeting, summarizing the relevant part thus: "Olcott wanted to go over and speak to him ... but though Narayan smiled, his eyes forbade approach."¹¹⁰ Hardly a blind yogi as Fuller makes him to be. Therefore, first, with Narayan's eyesight intact in 1883 it becomes quite hard to maintain by Fuller that Tiravala, allegedly blind in 1877, could be equated with Narayan.¹¹¹ A possible way out of this dilemma would be through a closer reading of Olcott's description of the yogi's portrait. One

could possibly reason that he is only seemingly blind, for his being in *Samādhi* only makes him appear so. But then Fuller's reason for equating the two persons just on the grounds of their blindness falls apart. Secondly, and this was addressed before, as Nagaratnaswami's blindness was probably a condition he was born with, because of what he thought were karmic reasons, it becomes quite improbable, though not entirely impossible, to equate Narayan with Nagaratnaswami on account of eyesight.

Appearance. As far as Narayan's appearance and bearing are concerned we find Olcott describing him in comparison to the other visitors at Blavatsky's reception as quite noticeable, "for he was to them, in majesty, as a lion to a whippet;"¹¹² and we have Leadbeater claiming "He holds Himself very upright and moves with alertness and military precision."¹¹³ On the other hand we have Wood seeing Nagaratnaswami, as one would expect from a blind person, "groping his way round the walls to find the doorway."¹¹⁴ Of course, again, it is possible that the yogi had his eyesight intact in 1895 and had turned blind by 1910. On the other side, I already pointed out that Nagaratnaswami was probably already blind at birth.

Language. Another discrepancy between Narayan and Nagaratnaswami is language. If one believes the claim that Narayan was involved in writing a) *Isis Unveiled*, b) two of the preserved Mahatma letters, and c) the letter to *The Theosophist* on the Arya Samaj issue, then one can only conclude that he can express himself in English very well—even though preferring the French language according to Olcott.¹¹⁵ On the other hand, according to Wood, Nagaratnaswami spoke Tamil, could understand a little English and needed an interpreter to communicate with him.¹¹⁶

Again, the characteristics of the two are not lining up well.

Smoking Cigars. Further, it is quite inconceivable that it would be Narayan who would complain to Wood about Blavatsky and Olcott that they had “dragged him out of his obscurity” and that Olcott would teach him to smoke cigars, as all befell Nagaratnaswami on their visit.¹¹⁷

Who’s whose Guru? As the conclusion [26] now dawns that the two yogis are not the same person it has to be pointed out that Wood was not convinced either. It was Wood’s friend Aiyar who had found Nagaratnaswami just outside Tiruvallam and who first made the pitch for identifying the two.¹¹⁸ Initially Wood is “decidedly open to the conviction,” but throughout the story of his several visits to the yogi, Wood never confirms the claim, actually distances himself from it at the end on account of the issue whether the yogi was the master of the legendary Theosophical Master Morya, as some Theosophists believed Narayan to be, or, other way round, the yogi was Morya’s disciple, as the yogi himself insisted.¹¹⁹ Wood expressed his position on the issue in the following way:

When I told Narayanaswami [Aiyar] and the other friends who had been with him on his first visit to Tiruvallam that the Paradeshi [trsl. the Wanderer, i.e. Nagaratnaswami] had explained to me that he was not the Master of Sitaram Bhavaji [Master Morya], but that Sitaram Bhavaji was his Master, they insisted that the mistake must be mine, and continued in their conviction that they had met the great Master [Narayan] himself.¹²⁰

My conclusion from reading the paragraph is that Wood did not share his friends’ conviction that Nagaratnaswami

could be equated with Narayan, and that Wood believed that Narayan was Morya’s Master and not the other way around. Interestingly, the blind yogi did tell Wood about the existence of “a greater Master [than Morya and his Kashmiri co-worker] living in the mountains north of Tiruvallam,” which could very well be the Tirupati Hills 50 miles due north, leaving open whether this might be the sought for Narayan. Fuller, believing that Narayan and Nagaratnaswami are one and the same person, takes the position of Aiyar as the correct one, i.e. Morya is Narayan’s master. The yogi himself thought that the mistake originated with Aiyar misunderstanding the yogi when he told him about his relationship with Morya on his very first visit.¹²¹ Fuller seems to locate the origin of the, in her opinion, mistaken notion that Narayan was Morya’s Master with Alice Bailey’s book *Initiations: Human and Solar*, which is problematic on two accounts. First, as far as a time line is concerned, her claim is quite a stretch, because the book was published in 1922, twelve years after Wood’s visits. Fuller might not have meant it as such, but in the main text we read that the “sage [Nagaratnaswami] told him [Wood] a mistake had been made by theosophists in describing him as the Master of Madame Blavatsky’s Master.” The accompanying endnote then informs us that the “mistake referred to by Narayan occurs in *Initiations: Human and Solar*, Alice Bailey, ...”¹²² If she had used the verb “duplicate” or “continue” instead of “occur,” or just added “still,” then it would be obvious that she was aware of the timeline involved. But, as it stands, it seems that she indicates that the book was at least one of the sources for the alleged mistake when Wood met the yogi in 1910. The second problem with this attribution is that Bailey actually never made that specific claim. She only stated that both Jupiter and Morya [27] work under the Manu¹²³ and in her diagram of “Solar and Planetary Hierarchies,” though

Morya is positioned directly under Jupiter, the explanation of the connecting lines is that they “indicate force currents” and therefore not necessarily guru-disciple relationships.¹²⁴ The question is open regarding the origin of the idea. It was probably not with Blavatsky, for she made the claim in an 1886 article for *The Path* that the master of Morya was the Maha Chohan.¹²⁵ My proposal is that by 1910 the idea that Narayan was Morya’s guru was established lore within the inner circle of Theosophists, possibly a teaching within the Esoteric School, from which both Wood and Aiyar took their cue.

Place(s) of Residence. At this point I would like to tackle the geographical angle in order to untangle Narayan’s possible place(s) of residence and present another weak link in Fuller’s reasoning. First, let’s summarize the record as far as names of places are concerned. It is perhaps in the speculative excursion of Olcott in 1877 that for the first time the elusive sage we are trying to flesh out is connected with a specific geographical place, i.e. the Tirupati and Nilgiri Hills. The Nilgiri Hills are ca. 260 miles southwest from Madras and the Tirupati Hills is the southern boundary of the Nallamala Range, next to the town of Tirupati about 70 miles northwest from Madras. Next we have Olcott in April of 1882 referring to the possibility of a Master living within a 100 miles radius of Madras, followed soon with a visit to Tiruvallam, 70 miles west of Madras, where at least Blavatsky, as rumor had it, might have met One. Two weeks later *The Theosophist* received a letter signed “Tiruvallam Hills,” regarded by some as coming from Narayan. A year later, in August 1883, Olcott visits Blavatsky in the Nilgiri Hills and observes her being overshadowed again by one or more Masters in composing the “Replies.” Both refer to either the “Tiravellum Mahatma” (Blavatsky) or the “Mahatma at

Tirivellum” (Olcott) as involved in the “Replies.” At least from Olcott it can be inferred that he meant Narayan. A month later, in September 1883, on their way from the Nilgiri Hills back to Madras, Olcott claims that both see Narayan in bodily form in Pondicherry, located about 100 miles south from Madras, just at the border of Olcott’s radius. In 1885 Olcott receives a messenger sent by the “Mahatma at Tirivellum,” again meaning Narayan. In the same year Leadbeater claims to have visited him with T. Subba Row at the sage’s own home, traveling there by train. Though no specific location is given, from Wood’s account it is clear it had to be Tiruvallam. In 1910 Wood and fellow-Theosophist Aiyar travel to Tiruvallam and meet a blind yogi named Nagaratnaswami. Aiyar and some other Theosophists think it is Narayan with Wood dissenting. The yogi states to have met both Morya and Koot Hoomi on one occasion and also Blavatsky and Olcott on another. He also stated that a greater Master than Morya and Koot Hoomi was living in the mountains north of Tiruvallam, possibly indicating Narayan and the Tirupati Hills. In a 1913 publication Leadbeater claims that Narayan “now” lives in the Nilgiri Hills, a claim repeated by Alice Bailey in 1922. In the 1920s David Anriasis resides on and off in the Nilgiri Hills and claims to have contacted him telepathically while living within [28] the “spiritual forcefield” emanating from Narayan’s ashram. So far the record.

Before moving on with presenting Fuller’s sense of Indian geography I would like to insert the plausible idea that the little French colony of Pondicherry might very well have been Narayan’s natural *milieu* for at least four reasons. First, the simple fact that the first and maybe only time H.P.B. and Olcott met him physically was there, in Pondicherry. Secondly, if Blavatsky’s get-together in Pondicherry was meant for local notables, as seems to have been the case, and

Narayan was amongst its guests, *ergo* he was probably a local notable. Thirdly, according to Olcott, Narayan prefers to communicate in French, which would make sense for a cultured inhabitant of a French colony in India. Lastly, Pondicherry, like Tiruvallam, is also within Olcott's 100 miles radius of Madras. And then there is the Theosophically meaningful coincidence that Pondicherry can historically be connected with the Rishi Agastya, who is allegedly none other than Narayan himself.¹²⁶

Can all the above claims co-exist peacefully or are there some improbabilities? Fuller's position of compounding Narayan and the blind Nagaratnaswami is highly problematic also on account of geography. Her position seems to boil down to leaving out the Pondicherry meeting with the ocularly healthy Narayan and collapsing Tiruvallam and the Nilgiri Hills as far as geographical distance is concerned. She states that Narayan was living in the Nilgiri Hills and that Nagaratnaswami "got about between villages in the Nilgiri Hills by bullock-cart,"¹²⁷ just after locating him also in the vicinity of Tiruvallam. This is literally quite a stretch because Tiruvallam and the Nilgiri Hills are around 200 miles apart, an enormous distance in those days, especially if traversed by cart. The claim is also entirely Fuller's, for it cannot be found in Wood's writings, though he states that the yogi "used to make long journeys from village to village."¹²⁸ In short, the Nagaratnaswami-Nilgiri Hills connection is, though not physically impossible, at least extremely weak. By contrast, the idea of a wealthy Narayan residing first in Pondicherry with some property in Tiruvallam and later changing residence to the Nilgiri Hills is somewhat less of a stretch of the imagination.

To be fair to Fuller it has to be stated that there is some strong circumstantial evidence for the mistaken claim of equating Nagaratnaswami with Narayan

on account of geography. After all, we have Olcott and some Theosophists talking about a Master in the vicinity of Madras, possibly Tiruvallam, where both Blavatsky and Olcott might have met him; Olcott, and possibly Blavatsky too, referring to Narayan as the "Mahatma at Tirivellum"; a Mahatma letter signed "Tiruvallam Hills"; Leadbeater and T. Subba Row meeting "Jupiter" there; and Nagaratnaswami, living there, claiming to have met two Masters and also Blavatsky and Olcott. But, as shown above, on account of eyesight, bearing and language the equation does not hold. The correct conclusion is obviously that Narayan and Nagaratnaswami are two different individuals, though sharing some similar attributes like owning property in Tiruvallam, knowing Morya, Blavatsky and Olcott, and being skilled in certain Siddhis, all of which contributed to erroneously collapsing the two persons into one. [29]

Age. At this point we finally arrive at the core of Fuller's reasoning in favor of the high improbability of Narayan meeting Anrias "roughly in the late 1920s" on account of the Rishi's very old age. She proposes that the old man had already died of old age "before the arrival of Anrias in the mid 1920s," because, a) as Tiravala, he was "no longer young" in the late 1850s; b) as Nagaratnaswami he was at least "in his late nineties if he had not passed the century" when Wood met him in 1910; and c) he was apparently deceased when "Wood returned to India after an absence of a few years."¹²⁹ First Fuller's time-line here has to be corrected as far as Anrias' whereabouts are concerned. According to Scott, Anrias arrived in India just after WWI, stayed for seven years and had left by 1927, which computes his year of arrival to 1920 and not the "mid 1920s." And, as Narayan was allegedly involved in the articles on astrology published in *The Theosophist* of October 1921, the Anrias-Narayan

meeting surely had already taken place before its publication date and not “the late 1920s.”¹³⁰ It appears that Fuller is pushing the meeting into the future to figuratively “kill off” the sage, but she does so without any solid reasons. Secondly, the supposed age of Tiravala in the 1850s is highly problematical to use as a base to infer Narayan’s age in the 1920s, because, if Tiravala is to be equated with the poet Tiruvalluvar, as both Olcott and Fuller do, he would not just be “no longer young” in the 1850s, nor a centenarian in 1910, but already a millenarian! (If so, one could suppose, a “mere” six decades of further aging should not have been impossible for him). Thirdly, even if the Narayan-Nagaratnaswami identification would hold, Anrias still *could* have met him, because Nagaratnaswami had only died for sure by 1933, for that was the year that Wood revisited Tiruvallam after an absence of more than twenty years, possibly expecting the yogi was still alive, and found that “the Paradeshi had died in the interval.”¹³¹ So, Nagaratnaswami could have been alive around 1920 to meet Anrias. In either case, with all the preparatory research it is obvious that Fuller’s reasoning is flawed because of her mistaken premise of compounding the three different persons of Narayan, Tiravala and Nagaratnaswami. Therefore, if Narayan cannot be equated with Tiravala then Narayan cannot be predicated as “no longer young” in the late 1850s on that basis. And if Narayan cannot either be equated with Nagaratnaswami, then the sage cannot be predicated as a centenary in 1910 on that account.

Now, with Tiravala and Nagaratnaswami out of play, what can still be said about Narayan’s age? He was considered actually already old by both Blavatsky and Olcott in the 1870s, for they refer to him a couple of times as “the Old Gentleman.” Further, according to Jinarajadasa, he is “one of the few

adepts who are in old bodies,”¹³² and Leadbeater claims that, as far as he knows, he is the only Master “whose hair shows streaks of grey,” when they allegedly met in 1895.¹³³ Bailey claims he is “looked up to by all the Lodge of masters as the oldest among Them.”¹³⁴ Though no exact age is given in any of these accounts on which to base a computation of Narayan’s probable year of birth, the route of making some plausible deductions is open and these might still save Fuller’s conclusion [30] regarding the high age of Narayan, though with entirely different arguments than she advanced, and with taking some steps she might not find acceptable. The deduction would be as follows: if Morya was H.P.B.’s guru and they indeed met in 1851 on her 20th birthday,¹³⁵ let’s say hypothetically that he himself must have been at least 30; and if Narayan was Morya’s guru (though Fuller thinks the relationship is other way around) it could be hypothetically argued that their age difference was also at least 10 years. Therefore, with Morya being born at least ten years before H.P.B., and Narayan at least another 10 years before Morya, Narayan should have been at least 20 years older than H.P.B. and therefore been born at least before 1811, which would make him minimally 110 years old when Anrias met him around 1920 and minimally 120 years old when he facilitated Anrias’ *Through the Eyes of the Masters*. The irony is that if one would change this deduction by incorporating Fuller’s belief that Narayan was, like H.P.B., Morya’s pupil, then that would put Narayan more or less into H.P.B.’s age bracket and therefore about 80 years old in 1910 and just over 100 in 1932. Not humanly impossible I think, and certainly not, Theosophically speaking, for an alleged Adept.¹³⁶

If these deductions were completely free from any Theosophical ideas—like the possible longevity, reincarnation or non-physical continuance of these

Theosophical masters and the Theosophical *legend element*¹³⁷ of the 1851 H.P.B.-Morya meeting—then it would indeed be unreasonable to accept that it was a 120 year old Narayan who was involved in the production of the serious challenges to Krishnamurti's teachings coming through Anrias' pen and pencil in 1932. But, as is the case with Fuller's skepticism regarding Scott's clairvoyance, it does not seem to be consistent for her, having been a Theosophist, to settle issues by *a priori* physicalist arguments.¹³⁸ Again, the working out of this line of reasoning is so drenched with Theosophical premises and arguments that it will be better left for a separate Theosophical study, which would also deal with methodological issues involved in doing research along Theosophical lines. I would like to make it clear that, though Fuller's premises and arguments regarding Narayan's age are flawed, if not refuted, her conclusion still has some merit, though she might not have found the alternative reasoning entirely acceptable.

IV. Conclusions

Two sets of different conclusions are called for to process the above material. One set will be devoted to examine the extent of fulfillment of the stated goals of this paper on page 2 and will be specific in nature. The other set will be devoted to the different and more general conclusions that can be generated from all the presented material through the prism of different metaphysical convictions.

Stated goals. Working backward from the four stated goals, starting with the last one, **d)**. I'm quite sure that "to further the discussion" has been abundantly accomplished, however with Jean's passing we can only look forward to her response, which she fortunately left us, and see if others might pick up the pen where she left off. Meanwhile there is

more in store from my side as much of the writings of Scott and Anrias still have to be explored on [31] a Theosophical-metaphysical level. **c)**. I hope that the reporting of religionist-metaphysical claims in this paper was done in a sufficiently methodologically agnostic mode, that both skeptics and Theosophists alike will not feel their arms twisted in either direction. The point here I think is for *students* of Theosophy to find the fine balance between the axiomatically held, and therefore reductionalistically employed, views of materialists on one hand and dogmatic religionists, including some Theosophists, on the other. For *academic* historians of Theosophy the point is to refine one's sense of methodological agnosticism and not become open or hidden debunkers or apologists. For *Theosophical* historians of Theosophy the lesson is even more complex, for it seems to call for a combination of the two above attitudes of resisting materialist and dogmatic reductions, including Theosophical ones, while still being open to Theosophical-metaphysical claims, though exposed where possible to the corrective influence of science and philosophy and tempered where appropriate by agnosticism. **b)**. Fuller obviously desired to prove her thesis of the impossibility of the Narayan-Anrias connection by reasoning that the sage was just too old to have ever met Anrias. To make her point she deduced his very high age from the ages of Tiravala and Nagarathnaswami, but, as she had erroneously conflated these two persons with Narayan, her reasoning cannot be accepted, though alternate argumentative strategies seem still open. Her eagerness to make her case is indicated by her mistaken timeline of Anrias' possible interaction with the sage, stretching his age at least another half a decade in favor of her thesis. Her eagerness also demonstrates that she, unexpected for a Theosophist, substitutes *a priori* physicalist arguments about

longevity for Theosophical views regarding the meta-empirical feats of adepts to live long lives and even attain non-physical continuance. a). The critical examination of Fuller's sources and facts uncovered some errors. She forgot her own reporting of Olcott's meeting with the not so blind Narayan, which could have saved her to make the erroneous Narayan-Nagaratnaswami identification in the first place; she apparently was not clear on the publication date of Bailey's *Initiations* book, which was 1922, erroneously making it into a source for views held by Theosophists in 1910; and she uncritically collapsed the distance between Tiruvallam and the Nilgiri Hills.

General conclusions. To give every metaphysical paradigm its due, four different positions will be developed: one neutral, one skeptical, one Johnsonian and one Theosophical, with the last one in four variations.

Neutral. Trying to take all the above information and arguments into consideration—especially disregarding Nagaratnaswami and Tiravala, for which there are multiple reasons—we are left with a reasonably consistent composite narrative *picture* (either real, fictional, fictionalized or a hybrid of all three) of an ocularly healthy, elderly, physically disciplined, and wealthy Narayan in his natural environment of Pondicherry, where he met H.P.B. and Olcott at a formal reception in 1883; sometimes to be found in Tiruvallam (Blavatsky, 1882; Leadbeater [32] and T. Subba Row, 1885), where he possessed some property (including a cottage and possibly a business), from where he sent an important article in 1882 commenting on the Arya Samaj issue through ordinary mail from Tiruvallam, subsequently published in *The Theosophist*, and from where he dispatched a messenger to Olcott concerning H.P.B.'s health. Later he relocated to his ashram in the Nilgiri

Hills, wherefrom in 1913, in a disembodied state he inspired Besant in her political work, influenced Anrias to come to India around 1920, and was involved with him in some articles on astrology for *The Theosophist* in 1921. At the same time, to complete the picture with Narayan's alleged siddhic feats, he was able to project himself occultly to several places: to New York, where he was involved with H.P.B. in the founding of the TS in 1875, the production of *Isis Unveiled* over a span of several years and the founders' departure to India in late 1877; to Mumbai (Bombay), getting involved with Olcott in the very first issue of *The Theosophist* in 1879; to the Nilgiri Hills in 1883, where he dictated through H.P.B. the abstruse "Replies," parts of which made it into the *Secret Doctrine*; and to England, where he was, at least meta-empirically still alive, involved with Anrias in the production of the 1932 publication *Through the Eyes of the Masters*, containing some rebuttals of Krishnamurti's iconoclasm, including a message by the sage himself. He also precipitated in the late 1870s a letter in New York with Olcott as its recipient and added a kind message for Olcott to an already existing letter in New York in 1877. To crown the picture, all of the activities of this Master have to be seen in the context of the widespread claims that he is the "spiritual Regent of India,"¹³⁹ possibly the reincarnation (or continuation) of the great Vedic Rishi Agastya; the guru of one of Theosophy's most important Masters, i.e. Morya, with whom he was involved during previous incarnations in some of the great migrations of the Aryans into the Indian sub-continent; and also being very close to his loyal servant in the outer world, Col. Henry Steel Olcott.

The Skeptical Argument. Any self-respecting materialist will axiomatically state that all the paranormal claims in connection with Narayan just cannot be

true. Either they were the outcome of fraudulent intent or delusional experiences. He might argue that Blavatsky just impersonated Narayan, making Olcott believe he was communicating with a Master; that she pretended to be dictated to by this sage in her writings; that she produced the pencils by sleight of hand; doctored her diary with Mahatmic commentaries; planted the Arya Samaj letter in Tiruvallam; and wrote some more “Mahatma letters” to influence Olcott. All done either to promote hidden political agendas, or for the love of a good story, or for the noble end of reforming humanity. He might argue that, because her stories were quite complex, some became inevitably inconsistent, as was the case with the Tiruvallam visit and the authorship of “The Replies.” Later, Leadbeater made up the Jupiter character as part of his scheme to create a new messiah and Besant invented her Agastya connection to justify her political activism in order to satisfy her irrepressible political nature. Then Bailey figured out the trick and incorporated Jupiter into her own [33] venture. And, lastly, Scott and Anrias didn’t like what Krishnamurti did to Theosophy and wrote together some fictional works around “J.M.H.” and “The Rishi of the Nilgiri Hills,” containing damning critiques of Krishnamurti’s status and teachings. Skeptics even might argue that in case these experiences were not intentionally fabricated and were actually lived as true by Blavatsky et al, all participants were therefore delusional, in which case the whole story would become quite an instance of a collective and infectious hallucination.

The Johnsonian Middle Position.

As mentioned earlier, K. Paul Johnson has not yet identified the historical person—if there was one—behind the cover of Narayan. Though I think his previous identifications have in large

measure been refuted, his general hypothesis—i.e. that the Theosophical masters were mythic covers for identifiable historical persons—was certainly not inherently implausible and worth testing. Maybe with the wealth of information provided above and his extensive readings about the lives of possible candidates he might find some historical person whose whereabouts and characteristics correspond with the ones claimed for Narayan. I’m doubtful about results, but open to consider them.

Theosophical. A Theosophical take on Narayan probably will fall largely in four groups: 1) Blavatskyite, 2) Leadbeaterite, 3) Anriasite and 4) Krishnamurtiite. The Blavatskyites, for example de Zirkoff, will accept the claims made by Blavatsky and Olcott about Narayan and not be disturbed too much about some inconsistencies. They probably will dismiss the Besant-Leadbeater material as un-Blavatskyite “Neo-Theosophy.”¹⁴⁰ The second group, with Jinarajadasa as an outstanding example, will also accept Leadbeater’s Jupiter and Besant’s Agastya material,¹⁴¹ while being silent, dismissive or ambiguous about the Scott-Anrias claims. I found four Theosophical reviews of the relevant Scott and Anrias books.¹⁴² Two of them are quite dismissive and one, by none other than Leadbeater himself, only seems dismissive, but is actually so full of ambiguous conflation of open criticisms and implied endorsements that it is hard to pin down what he is really thinking. To me it reads like a subtle hint to take Scott moderately serious, though Leadbeater can’t say so openly out of deference to Besant’s relationship with Krishnamurti. Only one was quite positive about Scott’s book. Hodson scholar and former pupil of the Theosophical seer (Hodson), William Keidan, wrote in a recent communication that he had discussed the Anrias matter with Hodson and came away with the impression that Hodson did not think it

was genuine.¹⁴³ The third group will also accept the Scott and Anrias claims, like a few others and I do. Outstanding in this group is the Baileyite esoteric astrologer Phillip Lindsay, who endorsed and incorporated multiple paragraph-long quotes from both Scott and Anrias in his esoteric astrological assessment of Krishnamurti.¹⁴⁴ This position will put us in opposition to the Krishnamurtiites in the Theosophical family, who consider the Scott-Anrias material as spurious.¹⁴⁵ This group was most notably represented by the kind and learned fellow Theosophist, Jean Overton Fuller, [34] who was the only one so far to engage this material in-depth, which brings us back to the context and reason of this paper.

V. Post Script: Krishnamurti and the Nilgiri Hills

As a *finale* it is interesting to highlight the significance of the Nilgiri Hills in Krishnamurti's occult life. He is after all the one whose metaphysical status is in question in this complex issue. When in 1912 Leadbeater thought the time was ready for Krishnamurti's second initiation he initially wanted that to take place in the Nilgiri Hills, where Olcott had built in 1890 a house meant as the summer residence for the President of the T.S. Due to the brewing legal problems regarding Krishnamurti's guardianship, Besant and Leadbeater took Krishnamurti to Europe and the actual initiation finally took place in Taormina on the Italian island of Sicily.¹⁴⁶ Many years later, just after World War II, when Krishnamurti stayed in Ootacamund in the Nilgiri Hills, his friends Pupul Jayakar and Nandini Mehta were present at either the resumption or dramatic intensification of Krishnamurti's mysterious "Process," which had laid more or less dormant since his stay at Pergine, Italy, in 1924, and this time lasted for three weeks.¹⁴⁷ In later letters to Nandini, Krishnamurti referred to his chakras as "the wheels of Ooty," using

the popular abbreviation of Ootacamund.¹⁴⁸ For some Theosophists the question might arise whether Narayan and Krishnamurti met on the latter's out-of-body travels during the Process and what the nature of their interaction might have been. Krishnamurti stated during those dramatic days in the Nilgiri Hills to his two friends that a collective "They" were involved in cleansing, even "burning" his body during the Process, and mentioned a single "he" or "him," for whom this all was apparently done: "They have burnt me so there can be more emptiness. They want to see how much of him can come."¹⁴⁹ Was Narayan part of the "They" and was Maitreya the "him" Krishnamurti referred to? Or was the Process conducted by the "great Devas of the Air," with whom Krishnamurti was cooperating and even taking initiations under, as Maitreya claimed *per* Anrias?¹⁵⁰ And was the Process conducted apart from the Masters as Krishnamurti had "cut himself adrift from the White Lodge" as claimed by "Sir Thomas" *per* Scott?¹⁵¹ If the latter were the case, then Narayan and Maitreya could only watch Krishnamurti go through his out-of-body experiences from a respectful distance and hope for the best. But here again we move into purely metaphysical territory better treated in a separate study.

Abbreviations of Frequently Cited Works and URLs of some of the Relevant Texts

BCW I-XV: Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, *H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings*, 15 vols., Compiled and edited by Boris de Zirkoff (Wheaton, IL/Adyar, Madras: The [35] Theosophical Publishing House, 1950-1991).

CS: Jean Overton Fuller, *Cyril Scott and A Hidden School: Towards the Peeling of An Onion* (Fullerton, CA: Theosophical History, 1998) [*Theosophical History Occasional Papers*, Vol. VII].

IDC: Cyril Scott, *The Initiate in the Dark Cycle* (London: Routledge, 1932). URL of full text of relevant chapters “Krishnamurti: A Problem” and “The Truth about Krishnamurti” at
<www.alpheus.org/html/source_materials/krishnamurti/k_aproblem.html>;
<www.alpheus.org/html/source_materials/krishnamurti/truth_about_k.html>.

ITT: Ernest Wood, *Is this Theosophy ...?* (London: Rider, 1936). URL of full text of relevant chapter “An Indian Yogi” at
<www.alpheus.org/html/source_materials/scott_anrias/Nagaratnaswami.htm>.

K&W: Jean Overton Fuller, *Krishnamurti and the Wind: An Integral Biography* (London: The Theosophical Publishing House, 2003). Full text of chapter “Scott and Anrias: Wood and the Blind Rishi” <www.alpheus.org/html/source_materials/scott_anrias/blind_rishi.htm> (The printed edition misses the reference marks to endnotes 18 and 24 – 27. In consultation with the author these were restored in the on-line version. Letter to author from Jean Overton Fuller, August 12, 2005).

LMW I-II: C. Jinarajadasa (comp.), *Letters From the Masters of the Wisdom*, First and Second Series (Adyar, Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1919 & 1925). Letter 54 and its accompanying note on Narayan were added in the 1945 3rd edition of the First Series.

M&P: Charles Webster Leadbeater, *The Masters and the Path* (Adyar, Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1925, 2nd revised edition 1927).

ODL I-VI: Henry Steel Olcott, *Old Diary Leaves: The History of the Theosophical Society*, 6 vols. (New York: Putnam, 1895-1935).

TEM: David Anrias, *Through the Eyes of the Masters: Meditations and Portraits* (London: Routledge, 1932). Full text of foreword by Cyril Scott and of messages by “The Rishi of the Nilgiri Hills,” “Master Koot Hoomi” and “Lord Maitreya” at:
<www.alpheus.org/html/source_materials/scott_anrias/scottintro.html>;
<www.alpheus.org/html/source_materials/scott_anrias/TEM-Rishi.htm>;
<www.alpheus.org/html/source_materials/scott_anrias/TEM-KH.htm>;
<www.alpheus.org/html/source_materials/scott_anrias/maitreya_da.html>.

¹ On April 8, 2009 Mrs. Fuller passed away at the age of 94. She led a rich life and I hope that her autobiography *Driven to It: An Autobiography* (Norwich, UK: Michael Russel Publishing, 2007) will be more widely available. Throughout the years of doing research for this paper we corresponded and she read two drafts. [36]

² The book has been reviewed in this journal. See *Theosophical History*, 10/4 (October 2004): 37-40.

³ CS, 1-5 & 49-53 and K&W, 165-173. See last page for the abbreviations of frequently cited works and URLs of full texts of relevant chapters.

⁴ A legitimate question would be about how to classify Scott and Anrias in relation to Theosophy. Are they to be designated as Theosophists, or Theosophical writers, or, as I neutrally express, Theosophically-minded writers, or just writers within the larger Theosophical movement? First, and historically speaking, there are some reasons to characterize them as firmly belonging to the Theosophical movement. For example, Scott's pseudonymous "Initiate" books were seen by some Theosophists as possibly coming from leading Theosophist Wedgwood, and the content of these books dwell on many Theosophical themes. Moreover, Anrias worked at Adyar for a while and had some of his astrological articles, co-authored with prominent Theosophist Fritz Kunz, published in *The Theosophist*, but he never became a member. Anrias' books are also filled with Theosophical themes and have many references to H.P.B., Annie Besant and Krishnamurti. Most of his works are carried by many T.S. (Adyar) libraries, some were reviewed in Theosophical periodicals, and, if still in print, are carried by Theosophical bookstores. Some Krishnamurtiite and anti-Krishnamurtiite Theosophists are aware of the Scott-Anrias esoteric interpretation of the W.T. project and engage the material from different positions (Leadbeater, Michel, Lindsey, Fuller and myself); and the biographical information we have indicates that they were at home in Theosophical circles. Typologically speaking, I think that Scott and Anrias are to be seen as instances of the ideal-type 'spokesperson' within the Theosophical movement in the way Olav Hammer understands that term in *Claiming Knowledge: Strategies of Epistemology from Theosophy to the New Age* [(Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2001, Numen Book Series, 90), pp. 36-37]. Hammer differentiates three levels of commitment to a movement (roughly: outsider, client, convert), and I would argue that a convert, as far as Theosophy is concerned, should be called a Theosophist, regardless of membership status or explicit

commitment to any of its different variations. Hammer also sees a level of being so committed and outspoken that one moves into a fourth level of becoming an innovative spokesperson. This would apply to Scott and Anrias as they moved within (or were committed to) the Theosophical worldview and made some "authoritative" innovations through their texts, especially on the subjects of romantic relations, music, health, the Masters and Krishnamurti. Their "reformulations" are occupying a "distinct and visible position" within the Theosophical movement. I think their writings might attain the status of "movement text." Though their influence might be small, they are original "spokespersons" nevertheless. In short, Scott and Anrias are committed to the Theosophical worldview and are medium-level influential, innovative spokespersons within the Theosophical tradition and therefore may be called Theosophists according to an etic taxonomy. An emic classification of the two writers according to Theosophical-metaphysical criteria (of which there are many variations) is of course a wholly different endeavor, though, if Theosophy is true to its program of synthesizing science into its doctrine, it will have to take the above etic classification into account and construct its own hybrid etic-emic one.

⁵ See also David Anrias, *Adepts of the Five* [37] *Elements* (London: Routledge, 1933). For a bibliography of works relevant to the issue with links to the relevant texts, see: <www.alpheus.org/html/bibliography/sa_bibliography.html>.

⁶ In the pamphlet *Krishnamurti: An Esoteric View of his Teachings* I tried to integrate the Scott and Anrias material with the thoughts of Blavatsky, Geoffrey Hodson and Elizabeth Clare Prophet (<<http://www.alpheus.org/html/articles/krishnamurti/onk.html>>).

⁷ See "Letter from Jean Overton Fuller, July 23, 1997" at <www.alpheus.org/html/communications/krishnamurti/fuller.html> and my March 1998 response at <http://www.alpheus.org/html/communications/krishnamurti/resp_to_fuller.html>.

⁸ For a clarifying reflection on subjective factors influencing the study of religion see section 1.4 "Subjective Involvement in the Study of Religion" in J.G. Platvoet *Comparing Religions: A Limitative Approach* (The Hague/Paris/New York: Mouton Publishers, 1982), 8-12. He recommends that besides appropriating other researchers' studies on religion one should also study those authors themselves, because even doing science is a

cultural activity that involves some subjectivity. True to this prescription he presents at the beginning of his study an autobiographical sketch and the major formational influences on his intellectual development. In this spirit one could consult Fuller's autobiography *Driven to It: An Autobiography* (Norwich, UK: Michael Russel Publishing, 2007). A little history of my own involvement with the Scott-Anrias material is posted on: www.alpheus.org/html/articles/scott_anrias/Scott-Anrias-Personal.htm.

⁹ CS 49-50.

¹⁰ Fullerton, California: Theosophical History, Occasional Papers, Vol. V, 1997. Full text at www.alpheus.org/html/articles/thopv/index.html.

¹¹ K&W 168.

¹² CS 49-50.

¹³ *Krishnamurti and the World Teacher Project*, 2.

¹⁴ *Krishnamurti and the World Teacher Project*, 12.

¹⁵ *Krishnamurti and the World Teacher Project*, 26.

¹⁶ See: "Krishnamurti: An Esoteric View of his Teachings" (*Alpheus*, 1997) at www.alpheus.org/html/articles/krishnamurti/onk.html and "The Masters and Their Emissaries: From H.P.B. to Guru Ma and Beyond" (*Alpheus*, 1997, 3rd edition 2005) at www.alpheus.org/html/articles/esoteric_history/story.html.

¹⁷ For an in-depth discussion of phenomenological empiricism see: Wouter J. Hanegraaff "Empirical method in the study of esotericism" *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* Volume 7/2 (1995): 99-129 (republished with permission on the Internet at www.alpheus.org/html/articles/esoteric_history/Hanegraaff1.htm) and the methodological introduction to Platvoet's *Comparing Religions*, pp. 1-35. Applying the differentiations developed by Twiss and Conser, Hanegraaff's phenomenological empiricism would be classified under the historical-typological "voice" in the phenomenology of religion. The other two voices are the essential and the existential-hermeneutical one, with Rudolf Otto and Max Scheler representing the first [38] and Paul Ricoeur and Merold Westphal the second. See the outstanding introduction to *Experience of the Sacred: Readings in the Phenomenology of Religion* (Hanover/London: University Press of New England, 1992) edited by Sumner Twiss and Walter Conser, Jr.

¹⁸ For the Husserlian background see James Cox *A Guide to the Phenomenology of Religion: Key Figures, Formative Influences and Subsequent Debates* (London/New York: Continuum, 2006), pp. 9-33. For the multi-faceted importance of

Husserl and Heidegger for Theosophy (and Krishnamurti) see my "The Relevance of Phenomenology to Theosophy" (*Alpheus*, 2005) at www.alpheus.org/html/articles/philosophy/phen&theos.htm.

¹⁹ For the URL see the bibliography.

²⁰ CS, 50.

²¹ K&W, 170.

²² K&W, 165.

²³ Jean Overton Fuller, personal letter, 23 July 1997 (see fn. 5 for URL of full text).

²⁴ "The Diaries of H.P. Blavatsky" in BCW I, 414. (From here on abbreviated as "The Diaries.")

²⁵ David Pratt "The Theosophical Mahatmas: A Critique of Paul Johnson's New Myth" (September 1997) <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/dp5/johnson.htm> [Accessed July 6, 2006]. {New URL: <http://davidpratt.info/johnson.htm>} [Accessed July 7, 2010]

²⁶ Jinarajadasa in LMW I (6th Ed.), 167-68 (relevant letter and note added in 1945 edition) and LMW II, 50; Josephine Ransom (Compiler) *A Short History Of The Theosophical Society* (Adyar, Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1938), 53; J.L. Davidge "Spiritual Regent of India: The Rishi Agastya" *The Theosophist* 65/9 (June 1944): 171-72; Boris de Zirkoff "Compiler's Notes" to "The Diaries of H.P. Blavatsky," in BCW I, 438; Charles J. Ryan *H.P. Blavatsky and the Theosophical Movement* (San Diego, Ca: Point Loma Publications, 1975), 96-97; Geoffrey A. Barborka *H.P. Blavatsky, Tibet and Tulku* (Adyar, Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1966), 414-15.

²⁷ 1. Tiruvallam (ITT, 166; "Mental Puzzle" *The Theosophist* 3/6, Supplement, 8); 2. Tiruvallar (K&W, 170); 3. Tirivellum (Olcott in *The Theosophist* 53/12, 733); 4. Tiravellum (Blavatsky "Inquiries of an English F.T.S." in BCW V, 134); 5. Tiruvellum (Soobiah Chetty in *The Theosophist* 47/6 and Olcott in ODL II, 344); 6. Tiruvallam (Ryan, 96). The village should not be confused with Tiruvallur, 25 miles west from Madras, which I initially did by looking for Fuller's Tiruvallar till Daniel Caldwell directed me to the correct geographical location. There is another Tiruvallam in India, but that one is located in the state of Kerala and can safely be ruled out.

²⁸ The story is in ODL I, 367-370 and the portrait faces page 368, though only in the first edition.

²⁹ ODL I, 869.

³⁰ ODL I, 368.

³¹ Many English translations exist. The one I found was *Kural: The Great Book of Tiru-Valluvar*

(Bombay, India: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1970) translated by C. Rajagopalachari. [39]

³² ODL I, 369.

³³ ODL I, 369.

³⁴ H.P. Blavatsky, *Theosophical Glossary* (Los Angeles: The Theosophy Company, 1966), 298.

³⁵ Blavatsky, *Theosophical Glossary*, 101.

³⁶ H.P. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, Volume I (Los Angeles: The Theosophy Company, 1974. This is a facsimile of the original edition of 1888), 207.

³⁷ M&P, 266 & 177.

³⁸ Alice Bailey, *Initiation: Human and Solar* (New York: Lucis Publishing Co., 1974 [1922]), 49 & 106.

³⁹ *Theosophical Glossary*, 298.

⁴⁰ *Initiation*, 49.

⁴¹ The editor of Blavatsky's collected writings, Boris de Zirkoff, took over, at least in one instance, the name that Olcott imagined that Blavatsky was using, and referred to Narayan in his "Chronological Survey" as the "Tiruvalluvar Yogi," without any further justification. "Chronological Survey" by Boris de Zirkoff in BCW I, lxiii.

⁴² K&W, 170.

⁴³ All Olcott quotes in this section from ODL I, 245-48.

⁴⁴ "[The Founding of *The Theosophist*]" in BCW II, 83.

⁴⁵ ODL III, 18.

⁴⁶ "The Diaries," 406-440.

⁴⁷ The enigmatic sentence runs thus: "Got samples of ore for M.—so much the less trouble for [seal of Narayan]." "The Diaries," 426.

⁴⁸ ODL I, 478.

⁴⁹ "The Diaries," 432.

⁵⁰ "The Diaries," 424 & 431-32; ODL I, 248-49.

⁵¹ LMWI, 168.

⁵² Bailey, *Initiation*, 53.

⁵³ M&P, 266. For other references to Jupiter see pp. 8 & 33.

⁵⁴ See footnotes to the Agastya section.

⁵⁵ *The Elder Brother*, 114.

⁵⁶ Annie Besant and C.W. Leadbeater *Man: Whence, How and Whither: A Record Of Clairvoyant Investigation* (Adyar, Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1913), 245, 255, 327, 332-333, 491, 499, 502. Idem, *The Lives of Alcyone*, Vol. II (Adyar, Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1924), 611, 616, 627, 643, 663.

⁵⁷ M&P, 33-34 & 266. The 1885 dating of the meeting is from Jinarajadasa in LMWI, 168. The

Nilgiri Hills reference comes from *Man: Whence, How and Whither*, Foreword, 6.

⁵⁸ ITT, 165-173. See bibliography for the URL of the full text of the relevant chapter "An Indian Yogi." [40]

⁵⁹ Instead of referring to this person as Narayanaswami, which would be a more usual rendering, I will refer to him as Aiyar to avoid confusion with the blind yogi Nagaratnaswami.

⁶⁰ ITT, 167-68.

⁶¹ ITT, 170-71.

⁶² K&W, 170-72.

⁶³ ITT, 172.

⁶⁴ For Scott's material on Anrias see: IDC, 88-90; TEM, 15-17 and Cyril Scott, *Bone of Contention: Life Story and Confessions* (New York: Arco publishing Company, 1969), 198-99.

⁶⁵ TEM, 26.

⁶⁶ "Some Fundamentals of Astrology" by Fritz Kunz and B.A. Ross, *The Theosophist* 43 /1-3 (October-December 1921): 53-67, 129-141 & 237-251. An open question here, which I have not yet determined, is if, and if so, what, Kunz knew about Anrias' alleged source.

⁶⁷ IDC, 89.

⁶⁸ See letter 24 in LMW II, 50.

⁶⁹ ODL I, 248.

⁷⁰ *Bone of Contention*, 199.

⁷¹ "A Mental Puzzle" *The Theosophist* 3/6 (June, 1882), Supplement, 6-8

⁷² G. Soobiah Chetty "The Purchase of Adyar Headquarters: A Reminiscence of H.P.B." *The Theosophist* 47/6 (March 1926): 741-747. On-line text at Blavatsky Study Center, 2004 <<http://www.blavatskyarchives.com/chettypurchase.htm>> [Accessed July 15, 2005].

⁷³ But in *The Theosophist* it was reported that the party actually did visit the temple: "In the evening, they visited the grand old temple and, in the flowergarden attached to it, Colonel Olcott performed the initiatory ceremonies of three gentlemen, ..." *The Theosophist* 3/9 (June 1882), Supplement, 2.

⁷⁴ ODL II, 344. De Zirkoff, in his incomplete note on Narayan ("The Diaries," 438, ftn. 42), wrote that both H.P.B. and Olcott saw Narayan on that date, which is not supported by Olcott, and which he slightly changes in a later volume, writing that it was "likely" that H.P.B. saw "one of the Adepts." ("Chronological Survey" in BCW IV, xxiv). The note is incomplete for he forgets to mention the September 1883 meeting in Pondicherry mentioned above, which is somewhat of an oversight. He also does not mention Olcott's claim

of the sage's possible involvement in the summer of the same year in the important series of articles titled "Replies to an English F.T.S.," for which de Zirkoff might have had, as will be shown below, an acceptable reason.

⁷⁵ "A Mental Puzzle," 6.

⁷⁶ For references see footnote 17.

⁷⁷ For the questions, answers, introductory remarks and compiler's notes see "Inquiries of an English F.T.S." in BCW V, 129-275. The questions came from Frederic W.H. Myers, who was co-founder [41] of the Society for Psychical Research and initially sympathetic to Blavatsky's occult claims.

⁷⁸ Henry Steele Olcott "Letters of H.S.O. to Francesca Arundale," *The Theosophist* 53/12 (September 1932), 733. Relevant quote also in de Zirkoff's introductory remarks to "Inquiries of an English F.T.S." in BCW V, 137.

⁷⁹ ODL I, 249.

⁸⁰ "The Diaries," 429.

⁸¹ Letter No. XXVIII (no date) in *The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to A.P. Sinnett* (Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1973 [1925], A.T. Barker, compiler), 63. Relevant quote also in BCW V, 134. As parts of these highly technical replies made their way into the *Secret Doctrine* and Blavatsky observes about these passages that she did "not understand ten lines in that occult and scientific gibberish," it could be deduced that Blavatsky might not have understood everything that went into her own *opus magnum*.

⁸² The connection is only made in the Cumulative Index to the Collected Writings published in 1991 in which the following entry can be found: "Nārāyan[a] (or Tirivellum Mahatma)," for which the editor of the that particular volume, Dana Eklund, is responsible and not de Zirkoff (BCW XV, 375). As pointed out in endnote 41, de Zirkoff used once the name of an old Indian poet to refer to Narayan as the "Tiruvalluvar Yogi," either echoing Olcott's chain of association or mistakenly substituting Tiruvalluvar for Tiravellum.

⁸³ Letter No. XXIII (August 15, 1883) in *The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to A.P. Sinnett*, 46. Relevant quote also in "Inquiries of an English F.T.S." (introduction) in BCW V, 133.

⁸⁴ Quoted in "Inquiries of an English F.T.S." (introduction) in BCW V, 135-36.

⁸⁵ T. Subba Row "The Occultism of Southern India" *The Theosophist* 10/4 (January, 1889), 228

⁸⁶ LMW I, 118 (letter) and 167-68 (note).

⁸⁷ LMW II, 50 & 51 with a facsimile reproduction facing p. 51.

⁸⁸ "Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?" *The Theosophist* 55/5 (February 1934): 526-527

⁸⁹ *H.P. Blavatsky, Tibet and Tulku*, 414.

⁹⁰ *Theosophical Glossary*, 9.

⁹¹ "Footnotes to 'Yoga' and 'Kalpa'" *The Theosophist* 5/3 (December 1883): 77-79 in BCW VI, 14.

⁹² "From Peace to Power" *The Theosophist* 51/2 (November 1929): 150.

⁹³ The other article by Besant was "To Members of the Theosophical Society" *The Theosophist* 51/6 (March 1930): 523-535. Also published as *The Work of the Ruler and the Teacher*, Adyar Pamphlets no. 135 (Adyar, India: TPH, 1930). C. Jinarajadasa "Dr. Besant's Occult Life," part IV, *The Theosophist* 54/8 (May 1933): 145-148. Besant did mention in an earlier article that there was a Rishi who was the spiritual ruler of India without identifying him or hinting at a special relationship. See her "Theosophy and National Life" *Adyar Bulletin* XI/8 (August 1918): 233. [42]

⁹⁴ For more specifics see Arthur H. Nethercot, *The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), especially the appropriately titled chapter "The Rishi Agastya and Home Rule for India," pp. 213-231.

⁹⁵ "Dr. Besant's Occult Life," 146. On page 147 one can find a facsimile of the note.

⁹⁶ *The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant*, 217.

⁹⁷ "Dr. Besant's Occult Life" (part IV), 146.

⁹⁸ Annie Besant "Theosophy and National Life" *Adyar Bulletin* 11/8 (August 1918): 233.

⁹⁹ "To Members of the TS," 524.

¹⁰⁰ *The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant*, 363.

¹⁰¹ *A Short History...*, 53. "The MASTER JUPITER ... is said to have been in the past the Rishi Agastya." (capitals in original)

¹⁰² LMW I (6th Ed.), 167. In his notes to letter 54 Jinarajadasa adds the remark that Narayan is "known in India by the name which he bore thousands of years ago, the Rishi Agastya." The letter and the note were added in the 1945 3rd edition.

¹⁰³ H.V. [Helen Veale] "The Rishi Agastya" in Annie Besant (Ed.) *Our Elder Brethren: The Great One's in the World's Service* (Adyar, India: TPH, 1934), 89. Thanks to Gary Belgarde at the Olcott Library at the Theosophical Society in America we could ascertain with a high degree of probability through logical elimination that the author was the

frequent contributor to Theosophical magazines Helen Veale.

¹⁰⁴ For the difference of Besant's and Leadbeater's view of politics see Gregory Tillett *The Elder Brother: A Biography of Charles Webster Leadbeater* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), p. 159.

¹⁰⁵ "On the Watch-Tower" *The Theosophist* 65/9 (June 1944): 161.

¹⁰⁶ J.L. Davidge "Spiritual Regent of India: The Rishi Agastya" *The Theosophist* 65/9 (June 1944): 168-72. For a more elaborate and critical investigation of all the myths surrounding this sage see *Agastya in the Tamil Land* by K.N. Sivaraja Pillai (New Delhi / Chennai: Asian Educational Services, 1985).

¹⁰⁷ In 1883 Blavatsky wrote: "If science in the face of Dr. Van Oven gives 17 examples of age exceeding 150, and Dr. Bailey in his *Records of Longevity* a few as high as 170—then it does not require a great stretch of "credulity" in admitting the possibility of reaching through *adept* powers the double of that age." "Do the Rishis Exist?" *The Theosophist* 4/8 (May 1883): 203 in BCW IV, 448. See endnote. 136 on some more recent scientific findings on longevity.

¹⁰⁸ Blavatsky wrote: "In India the chela of the third degree of Initiation has two Gurus: One, the living Adept; the other the disembodied and glorified Mahātma, who remains the adviser or instructor of even the high Adepts." "The Objects of the Mysteries" in *The Secret Doctrine* (Adyar, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 1938) Adyar Edition, Vol. V (the alleged "third" volume of *The Secret Doctrine*), 282 and in BCW XIV, 278.

¹⁰⁹ ODL III, 18.

¹¹⁰ Jean Overton Fuller *Blavatsky and her Teachers: An Investigative Biography* (London and the Hague: East-West Publications / London: Theosophical [43] Publishing House, 1988), 118.

¹¹¹ Another reason, and this one Theosophical, *not* to identify the poet Tiruvalluvar with Narayan is—provided one takes Leadbeater seriously—that in *The Lives of Alcyone* the poet makes an appearance by his own name as the friend of "Mizar" (Nityananda) in life no. 47 of "Alcyone" (Krishnamurti), without being identified as "Jupiter," the star name given to Narayan in Leadbeater's clairvoyant venture. See Annie Besant and C.W. Leadbeater, *The Lives of Alcyone*, Vol. II (Adyar, Madras: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1924), 702-703.

¹¹² ODL III, 18.

¹¹³ M&P, 33.

¹¹⁴ ITT, 167.

¹¹⁵ ODL III, 18.

¹¹⁶ ITT, 170 & 172.

¹¹⁷ ITT, 172.

¹¹⁸ ITT, 166.

¹¹⁹ ITT, 172-73.

¹²⁰ ITT, 173.

¹²¹ ITT, 172.

¹²² K&W, 170 with endnote no. 25 on page 173.

¹²³ *Initiation*, 53.

¹²⁴ *Initiation*, 48. If the lines were indications of guru-disciple relationships then "Master K.H." (Koot Hoomi) would have had at least three gurus and "Master D.K." (Djual Khool) even five! It might be clearer to think of the positions in Bailey's chart as 'offices', which can be held by different adepts with the possibility that a "superior" might also be at the same time the guru of his "inferior."

¹²⁵ "The Theosophical Mahatmas" *The Path* (New York), 1/9 (December 1886): 257-263 in BCW VII, 248.

¹²⁶ See reprints of articles by G. Jouveau-Dubreuil in the chapter "Vedapuri, Agastya, and the Ashram (Analysis of a Legend)" in *Documents in the Life of Sri Aurobindo* (Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Ashram Trust, 1999 - 2006) <<http://www.sriurobindoashram.org/research/show.php?set=doclife&id=24>> [accessed March 28, 2007].

¹²⁷ K&W, 170.

¹²⁸ ITT, 166.

¹²⁹ K&W, 172.

¹³⁰ See endnote 64 for all the sources on Anrias.

¹³¹ ITT, 173.

¹³² LMWI, 167.

¹³³ M&P, 33.

¹³⁴ *Initiation*, 53.

¹³⁵ The assumption that it was Master Morya whom H.P.B. met in London is by itself problematic as at least Liljegren and Johnson pointed out. Johnson [44] found that H.P.B. gave several versions of her 1851 meeting and "at least four distinct versions of her later acquaintance with the Master." He thinks it more plausible that she actually met the Italian revolutionary Giuseppe Mazzini, as she was quite interested and involved in Italian politics. She regarded him very highly, even to the point of possibly regarding him a master of sorts. [K. Paul Johnson *The Masters Revealed: Madame Blavatsky and the Myth of the Great White Lodge* (New York: SUNY Press, 1994), 40-42] Liljegren's proposal is that

H.P.B., when she wrote in her scrapbook of having met "le Maître de mes rêves" in Ramsgate in the summer of 1851, that she actually referred to the influential English novelist Edward Bulwer-Lytton, for whom she also had a very high regard (to the point of having developed maybe something of an infatuation), and who was known then to possibly stay at Ramsgate that summer. With the help of Bulwer's grandson Nevil, Liljegren established the fact that Bulwer was at Ramsgate during that summer, and both men found it "extremely probable" (p. 28) that, given Bulwer's status and whereabouts and H.P.B.'s high esteem for him, that H.P.B.'s Master of her dreams was none other than the novelist and that she only merely saw him, but never met. [S.B. Liljegren *Bulwer-Lytton's Novels and Isis Unveiled* (Uppsala-Copenhagen-Cambridge, MA: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln-Ejnar Munksgaard-Harvard University Press, 1957), 23-29.] I think Liljegren is on to something because the sketch accompanying the scrapbook entry depicts a boat scene at a harbor and contains a structure recognizable as the still existing clock tower at Ramsgate harbor, all indicating that at least she was familiar with the place. H.P.B., when she got hold again of her scrapbook in 1885 or '86, told her friend Wachtmeister that Ramsgate was a blind for London, as she did not want any nosy person reading her scrapbook to know where the actual meeting took place. [Countess Constance Wachtmeister et al., *Reminiscences of H.P. Blavatsky and The Secret Doctrine* (Wheaton, IL: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1976 [1893]), 44-45] I think this is little bit of a stretch because one could ask about what could be reasonably deduced from the Hyde Park, London location and for whom was she hiding it? And why would she go through the trouble of adding a misleading sketch? My hypothesis is that when H.P.B. confessed to the blind, she actually was creating a double blind to cover up the significance of the deducible Ramsgate-Bulwer connection. Therefore, in short, if H.P.B. did not meet Morya in London in 1851 then we cannot indirectly establish a reasonable age for Morya's superior Narayan based on that premise. And establishing when she actually met the master for the first time is also quite problematic as, according to Johnson, there are at least "four mutually contradictory versions" (p. 42) of her 'later' acquaintance with him.

¹³⁶ Longevity has since the 1990s become a serious public and scientific issue. An interesting and relevant find is that since the 1960s the West has seen an exponentially growing increase in

centenarians and supercentenarians (110+) and that the supposed maximum lifespan of our species has recently been upgraded from 112 to 122. See: J.M. Robine and J.W. Vaupel "Emergence of supercentenarians in low mortality countries" in *North American Actuarial Journal*. 6 (2002) 3: 54-63. <<http://user.demogr.mpg.de/jwv/pdf/AmActJournal2002.pdf>> [accessed August 21, 2007]. Given this emergence the two researchers use "the new concept of the plasticity of ageing" and see the necessity of "describing how *small changes in environment and genomes* may result in large [45] changes of lifespan." (Italics added) Idem., "Supercentenarians slower ageing individuals or senile elderly?" *Experimental Gerontology*. 36 (2001): 915-930. <<http://user.demogr.mpg.de/jwv/pdf/science.pdf>> [accessed August 21, 2007].

¹³⁷ The term *legend element* I took from Olav Hammer's study *Claiming Knowledge: Strategies of Epistemology from Theosophy to the New Age* [(Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2001, Numen Book Series, 90), 40]. It refers to any relatively recent event considered important and factual in a religious movements' perception of its own history and is differentiated from the term *mythic element*, which is a component of a more overarching narrative about the cosmos or mankind, for example the meme of the rise and fall of Atlantis. The alleged 1851 meeting between H.P.B. and Morya would fit the definition of *legend element*, as it is believed by Theosophists that it was at that relatively recent and important, real event that the seed was planted for the T.S. and H.P.B.'s writings. Both mythic and legend elements can be construed in either a neutral hermeneutic way in the mode of Hanegraaff's phenomenological empiricism, or in a more skeptical analytic way as Hammer does. Hammer thinks the hermeneutical approach is problematic as it uncritically puts some of the empirical propositions made by a movement beyond the scope of scrutiny by treating them as if they were meta-empirical claims, and thereby such an approach might get "ideologically blinkered," that is, apologetic. (xv, fn. 3) Meanwhile Professor Introvigne is not happy with Hammer's approach and thinks he is an old-fashioned reductionist more interested in debunking than in understanding why and how certain beliefs are so popular and get disseminated. See Massimo Introvigne's review of Olav Hammer's *Claiming Knowledge*, "Inspector Clouseau and the Case of 'Religious Kitsch'" <http://www.cesnur.org/2002/mi_hammer.htm> [accessed June 10, 2009]. This is an ongoing

discussion on methodology and it is my conviction that Theosophists have to find their own voice in this as they are increasingly the subject matter of academic studies and risk to be, at least in the public eye, 'objectified,' defined, and explained away.

¹³⁸ An analysis of Fuller's position on Scott's clairvoyance will also have to be treated in a more Theosophical study.

¹³⁹ M&P, 33.

¹⁴⁰ On the Theosophy vs. Neo-Theosophy issue see the few remarks by James Santucci in "The Aquarian Foundation" *Communal Societies*, vol. 9 (1989): 43-44, posted at the Theosophical History web site at: <http://www.theohistory.org/aquarian_foundation.pdf> [accessed January 18, 2008]. For a probably adequate overview and links to primary sources see the Wikipedia entry on Neo-Theosophy at <en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neo-Theosophy> [accessed January 18, 2008]. See also: James Santucci, "Theosophy and the Theosophical Society," in *Odd Gods: New Religions and the Cult Controversy*. Edited by James R. Lewis (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 2001): 277-79.

¹⁴¹ According to Tillett (Tillett, 278) the Leadbeaterites might be divided in two sub-categories. The first category would accept his work before 1906 as "sound clairvoyant investigations," while rejecting "his later works, especially *Man, The Lives and The Masters and the Path*, as being essentially works of fiction." The second category would therefore also accept the Jupiter material as equally sound, or with some reservations like Fuller does. [46]

¹⁴² Review of Anrias' *Through the Eyes of the Masters* in *The American Theosophist* 21/3 (March, 1933): 73. Reviews of Scott's *The Initiate in the Dark Cycle* in *News and notes of the Theosophical Society in the British Isles* (May, 1932): 14; *The Theosophical Messenger* 20/12 (December, 1932): 286; *The Theosophist* 55/1 (October, 1933): 113-115 by "C.W.L." including remarks about Anrias' book. (Reproduced on-line at <www.alpheus.org/html/reviews/scott_anrias/CWL-ReviewScott.htm>).

¹⁴³ E-mail from William Keidan to author, December 29, 2007.

¹⁴⁴ Phillip Lindsay, *The Initiations of Krishnamurti: An Astrological Biography* (Palmerston North, New Zealand: Apollo Publishing, 2002).

¹⁴⁵ An interesting exception would be the Krishnamurtiite Peter Michel, who did refer positively to Scott and Anrias in his *Krishnamurti:*

Love and Freedom—Approaching a Mystery (Woodside, CA: Bluestar Communications, 1995) in endnotes 113 and 138 and did agree with them that Krishnamurti was not the expected teacher (Letter to the author, August, 1995). On how Michel incorporated the Scott and Anrias material see my review of his book at <www.alpheus.org/html/reviews/krishnamurti/rev_michel.htm>.

¹⁴⁶ Mary Lutyens *Krishnamurti: The Years of Awakening* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1975), 56. For an in-depth account of this event see Joseph E. Ross *Krishnamurti: The Taormina Seclusion-1912* (Ojai, Ca.: Joseph E. Ross/Book Doctor, 2000). For a review see *Theosophical History*, 8/7 (July 2001), 209-211.

¹⁴⁷ Pupul Jayakar *Krishnamurti: A Biography* (New York: Harper & Row, 1986), 125-30.

¹⁴⁸ Jayakar, 242-43.

¹⁴⁹ Jayakar, 128.

¹⁵⁰ TEM, 65.

¹⁵¹ IDC, 136.