

# About the Ego and the Unmanifested Being

There is no Period When  
Equilibrium in Life is Absolute

Visconde de Figanière



Visconde, or Viscount, de Figanière (1827-1908) and Helena Blavatsky

## **A 2020 Editorial Note:**

The following article is transcribed from “Lucifer” magazine, February 1890 edition, pages 471-480. The word “Lucifer” is a pre-Christian, Latin term meaning “light-bringer”. The word refers to the planet Venus, the morning star, the “elder sister” of our Earth, and has been grossly distorted by ill-advised theologians. See the articles “[Lucifer: What’s In a Name?](#)” and “[The History of a Planet: Venus](#)”.

Longer paragraphs of the article have been divided into shorter ones, so as to make a contemplative reading easier. Two of the footnotes to the article were written by Helena Blavatsky, the editor of the magazine.

Author of various valuable books, V. de Figanière (1827-1908) was a friend of H. P. Blavatsky and a member of her Esoteric School. During the 1870s, being the diplomatic representative of Portugal in Russia - envoy and minister plenipotentiary - , he lived in Saint Petersburg in a house which belonged to her family.

(Carlos Cardoso Aveline)

000

## About the Ego and the Unmanifested Being

Visconde de Figanière

### SECTION I

“The case for Metempsychosis”, by Edward Douglas Fawcett <sup>1</sup>, is an instructive, suggestive and learnedly-written treatise, which I have read with much interest and profit. There are, however, two important points to which I beg to demur, taking my stand upon Theosophical teachings, and inferences I have drawn therefrom. These last are possibly wrong, nor do I presume to offer them for more than they may be worth, which is not for me to judge.

In the first place, is there such a thing as an “animal Ego”, and is the human Ego a progress thereupon? In the SECRET DOCTRINE it is shown that the two monads, the *higher* and the *lower*, proceed from *opposite* points of the circle of evolution (see vol. I. pp. 177, 178, vol. II. pp. 45, 103, 421, 422). Seeing that Theosophical terminology is still somewhat backward, and in order to a clearer understanding between writer and reader, I shall, in this article, apply the word *soul* exclusively to man - and entities higher than man - as that which is *the vehicle of the Ego*; and *monad*, to that which, in the lower entities, is *the vehicle of consciousness* variously graduated. (Consciousness, in its wider sense, does not necessarily imply egoity.)

Now, the human soul proper is a resultant of the *fall* from a “higher” (albeit imperfect, or *inexperienced*) sphere of existence; whilst its *lower element* signifies a *rise* of the *monad* (the *animal monad*, as the latter means a rise for the *vegetable monad*, and this a rise for the *mineral monad*).

I am considering the phenomenon in its *initial* stage or aspect. That lower *spurious* element, or *animal* psychic essence, is what is cast off, in Kama Loka, by the human soul, so far as it

---

<sup>1</sup> “Lucifer” magazine, October and November 1889, pp. 107 and 199. (V. de F.)

can be cast off. Ergo, the sphere of Kama Loka is the *nec plus ultra* of the monad, as it finally manifests itself in the human soul. And this is quite logical, in that it is on a corresponding plane that the monad *began* its career, *i.e.*, what is usually termed the “astral” sphere, the world of prototypes. In this said world the last comer was the human prototype; human only by the grace of *form*; the respective entity could claim to be of no higher category than the *sub-human*, the uppermost principle of which was the *monad*. So that there were four principal grades of the monad, originally, as there still are in the astral planes, *viz.*, mineral, vegetable, animal and *sub-human* (not human proper). It was by the union of *gravitating* “souls” with the “monads” of the *sub-humans* (and therefore with monads on the *rising* scale) that *human* entities first appeared - this is what the SECRET DOCTRINE denominates “perfected” or “finished” men (in contradistinction to the “mindless” men, or sub-humans), and simply owing to the *Ego*’s advent. Hence, how can there be such a thing as an “animal Ego”? But of this anon.

Leaving, now, the initial aspect, for that of *continuity*, the “animal psychic element” in man (being the analogue of the monad in lower creatures and things) is that which comes by *heredity*, proceeding from the corresponding psychic essence of the parents (just as the monad, in animals and plants, is transmitted from parent to offspring - for, like the flame or light, a monad gives off its power to countless existences without that power diminishing one iota). Whereas the “soul” comes direct from its long rest in Devachan, and takes possession of the foetus by precipitating itself *into that lower element or animal psychic essence*.

Nothing of the kind occurs in the other kingdoms. This psychic essence (of the kingdoms), in its different types, is of course bound to *progress*, but not in an *individual* sense; its individuality only affects the *group* of essence manifesting under a given type. Doubtless, when life leaves a single plant or animal it is because the monad has withdrawn; for “life” is nothing else but the *sum* of the monad’s occult *activities*, and not an element *per se*. What becomes of the monad which thus withdraws? It goes to a *higher* astral level than that from which it issued when it manifested on the physical plane; but it *does not return to earth* during the same round or cycle.<sup>2</sup> This requires some explanation.

The astral planes are the “reservoir” of the monadic types constituting four great divisions (embracing many sub-divisions), *viz.*, mineral, vegetable, animal and sub-human. The bases, as it were, of this reservoir are the original centres from which the physical prototypes issued.

The *progress* of the monad implies *retrocession* of form (otherwise called the “law of retardation”). That is to say a group of monadic essence “progresses” by manifesting under a *type* of life corresponding to that abandoned by a group *in advance* of it, whilst the said type, developed by it on earth and abandoned when it withdraws, accrues to the group which *follows* it, and so forth (this will be made clearer just beyond). So that a *type* which has completed its physical evolution, is always *falling back*, serving at each break for an *inferior* monadic group (it is the *astral* power, or dynamic centre, of that type which “falls back”, not objectively, but subjectively speaking).

The monad’s progress is through successive stages *within* the Kingdom before it passes to those of another, etc. This progress being tantamount to *physical* evolution, it follows that the withdrawing monads go, for their temporary rest, to a *higher* astral plane than the one they

---

<sup>2</sup> The monad that withdraws leaves, or has left, its power in the *seed*. (V. de F.)

belonged to at their departure from that sphere; and as they have no individuality, the in-flowing monads form one with the essence-group constituting that higher level.

This signifies a *centre of consciousness* - a final course of the *dynamic* centre above mentioned - and the *power* of a *new* dynamic centre.<sup>3</sup> Each *astral* centre corresponds either to a *physical* group *in being*, or to such a group *of the future*. Now, it is not by that *new* centre that the physical species or variety from which it issued can be *influenced*. For, be it remembered, as Theosophy teaches, there is constant action and reaction between the physical and astral worlds.

Besides the complex general aspect, there is a special one between an astral centre or subcentre and the corresponding species or its subdivisions. This special action from the astral plane - which may be something analogous to what is called "overshadowing" - is, and cannot be otherwise than, *collective* as identified in a monadic group or centre. Well, this influence, as stated, cannot proceed from the *new* centre (since the latter constitutes an advanced mode of the law), and can only come from the *old* centre, *i.e.* that forming part of the "reservoir", as I have expressed it.

Now - the case being thus briefly stated - it is quite conceivable that when a *species* on earth (plant or animal) *is dying out*, this results from the fact that that collective influence *has ceased*. For the latter will cease *before* complete extinction of the species. This calls for consideration under two heads.

*Firstly*, if a monad can communicate its essence indefinitely without losing power, it is no doubt due to that *maintained* influence from the original centre. Therefore, when the latter ceases to act, the corresponding monads manifesting on earth will no longer be able to transmit their power without loss to themselves; whence a gradual subsidence on the field of manifestation.

*Secondly*, as that centre depends as much on the earth monads as the latter do upon it<sup>4</sup>, a time must come when the latter's progress is such that correspondence loses ground. That is to say,

---

<sup>3</sup> The escape of monadic essence identifies the *periphery* in regard to matter, and constitutes a centre of "consciousness" which is the power of a new centre of "force". This, the dynamic centre (the *laya* of the SECRET DOCTRINE), develops matter, and is periphery in regard to consciousness, being the power of a new conscious centre. The "new" centre, of either category, may be a *material* or an *ethereal* progress, according to the aspect contemplated. The whole process of evolution is an inverted manifestation of such centres, at one time developing distance, at another approximating. At the extremes only one is manifested. The inorganic state is a *centre of force*. Primeval superorganic existence was a *centre of consciousness*. (V. de F.)

<sup>4</sup> But little light has been thrown on the subject of *elementals*, but that little intimates that elementals are a sort of parasites; and that a given elemental group will relapse into inactivity (in regard to its counterpart), except at the expense of that counterpart, its earth-correspondence. Giving and receiving are reciprocal; but in what the *difference* consists is the question.... The word "elemental" seems sometimes rather loosely used. As far as I can make out, the *real* elementals are those connected with the *inorganic* states. The others are of a more advanced category, and I prefer calling them "monadic types", the highest order of which are the *sub-humans* the rest being astral counterparts of the *vegetable* and *animal* kingdoms. (V. de F.)

the astral centre (which does not progress, but merely subsists) is no longer in tone with the requirements of the *type* developed on earth. Therefore, on the one hand, the latter loses the benefit of that *staying* influence - and its extinction becomes a mere question of time (does not decline always follow upon culmination?). Whilst, on the other hand, the astral centre has been left behind, as it were, the energy expended being in process of accumulation at that *new* centre, as transmitted by the intervening physical type.

It, the old centre, does not dwindle, however, or lose its energy; its inactivity only regards its ex-objective.

Its energy is now concentrated on a *lower* group of monadic essence, whereby the type of which it is the power (and whose earth-career is over or closing) is in *retardation* (since it is objectivizing an inferior group), whilst the essence it formerly objectivized has *progressed* (the new centre).

What alone perishes - and for ever - are consummated effects, the intervening value, *i.e.* the physical species, in as far as this means *type* (a certain *form*, a certain *mode* of life, and a certain bye-law of *cohesion* the *three* lower occult activities, being properties of the *body*.)<sup>5</sup>

In view of what precedes, I suggest that the “vague conception” *exhaustion of prolific force* is nearer the truth, for explaining sterilisation, than *withdrawal of the animal Egos previously “informing” that force* (paragraph 205). There is no *rebirth* for the monad; no monadic essence returns to the physical plane under the *same type* wherewith it departed; and with regard to the lower kingdoms there can be no “informing” power having the character of an *Ego*.

As to racial sterilisation in man, there seems no doubt it arises from the dearth of Egos in respect of a given race, family, or individual couple. That is, as Mr. Fawcett tersely puts it: “no birth-seeking Ego, no birth”, and this is quite thinkable, in that, as the Ego’s cyclic level rises, the Ego-affinities will become more and more estranged from those of inferior, worn-out races, and such Egos will only seek incarnation in races of higher standard, etc.

But this shows that the inferior or hereditary psychic essence (commonly called the “animal soul”) can have nothing or very little to do in the matter.

It will merely constitute the dominant law of the foetus - *i.e.*, the *animal* or physical heat - up to the Ego’s advent, whereupon the foetus falls at once under the higher law - that of the *soul*, which is no doubt the power that determines the *sex*, and consequently the definitive mould of the person. Embryology has established that up to a certain period the embryo shows no difference of sex, and it is presumable that incarnation takes place immediately prior to such manifestation.

---

<sup>5</sup> Observe the difference: in the case of mankind, *consummated* effects are *four*, not *three*; the fourth activity does not outlive Kama Loka. In other words, the “soul” depends on its *fifth* activity, the monad on its *fourth*. (V. de F.)

Falling under the new law means that the animal life of the embryo becomes essentially dependent on the soul, to the extent that a withdrawal of the latter (whether the withdrawal be pre-natal or post-natal) is followed by death. <sup>6</sup>

This leads to the question, Is it possible that when an embryo has developed to a certain stage, no Ego should be forthcoming, or, in other words, that among the Egos seeking birth, there should be none with the affinity subjecting it to that particular attraction? It seems to me the answer must be in the *negative*. Otherwise we should have to admit the possibility of birth being given by a human being to a creature *without an Ego*, to a non-descript (!); or else suppose that such cases are met by the accidents classed as premature birth, etc. But it is hardly worthwhile to entertain such suppositions, nor would they advance the point chiefly under consideration - racial sterility.

I quite agree with Mr. Fawcett when he says (page 201, "Lucifer" magazine, November 1889), that consciousness is the contribution of the Ego *overshadowing* a nascent organism. What I contend for is that the "overshadowing" Ego is not the analogue in man of what he calls an "animal Ego". This I have sufficiently dwelt upon. As to the "overshadowing", it may be suggested that as the Ego, when passing from Kama Loka (where it leaves the lower element) into Devachan, conveys an adhering vestige (*vasoma*, or aroma) of that element - being that precisely which impels it to rebirth - it is the sympathy between that vestige and the *lower* psychic element of a human couple that brings about the overshadowing, as the term goes. Consequently, it is inferable that, in the absence of any such sympathy or mutual affinity or overshadowing, in respect of a given couple, or of a given race, the said lower psychic essence *ceases to manifest itself* - that is to say, not only "no embryo can mature into a perfectly organized infant", but *there will be no embryo whatever*.

## SECTION II

"In the unity of Nirvana Spirit attains to complete self-realisation through the perfected Egos now restored to It. Perchance the drama of Evolution has this end as its justification, and tends in consequence, as M. Renan has suggested, to the perfection of Deity. Hegel's profoundly significant teaching, to the effect that the Absolute is '*essentially result*' cannot in this

---

<sup>6</sup> I may add that my idea of the process is, to state it briefly, as follows. The *psychic essence* of the embryo being of a panchi-kritan nature, whilst the *vehicle* of the Devachanic soul is of a tanmatric nature, the latter, at incarnation, is involved by the former, in consequence of a certain revival or manifestation of the latent tanmatric integrants of the embryo's panchikritas (for each of the five grosser elements - panchikritas - is an atomic integer whose quintuple value is tanmatric). That is to say, the basic value of the *highest* panchikrita, "akas" (numerically the 5th), which basic value is the 5th tanmatra (also present, at various degrees, in the other four embryonic panchikritas), becomes the attractive influence exerted on the soul's *lowest* tanmatra (numerically the 1st, which is the factor of cohesion, in whatever degree). Then, at precipitation - by means of the inverted correspondences of those two subtle elements - the panchikritan tanmatras and those of the soul assimilate or unite, each of the five with its similar, whereupon the tanmatric "body" or form - the soul's *vehicle* - falls into latency, the vehicle now becoming panchikritan. But as the soul-tanmatras identify a higher plane (the *fifth*) than the embryo's panchikritan tanmatras (whose genetic plane is the *fourth*), it is the higher law that prevails; and henceforth the embryo and its panchikritas are subject to that law, for energy in its ultimate is *tanmatric*. (V. de F.)

connection be too strongly insisted upon. Finality, however, in speculations such as these is beside the question” (Page 209 of the November 1889 edition of “Lucifer”).

This is quite admissible in the light of Pantheism; nay, I think it is the logical conclusion to which it leads. The question is whether Pantheism - as the word is commonly understood - is in agreement with the best teachings of Theosophy. In view of some texts, it is; in that of others, it is not, I mean as I understand them, while perhaps I have misunderstood them. Without going deeply into the subject, I may observe that the Great Breath which “never ceases” (SECRET DOCTRINE, Vol. I. p. 55, see pp. 14, 573), and is above or behind all manifested causes, is not presented in the light of a *constitutive* principle. No class of phenomena can be traced farther than the Logos (Ishwara, etc.). If the Great Breath *never ceases*, even when the Universe has reverted to its germ-state, it stands to reason that the eternally Unmanifested Cause can have nought in common with that which proceeds from the germ.

The inferences which, I think, are to be drawn from the above, and other texts, are what may be summarized as follows. Eternity and time can never be assimilated. Time is a mere correlative of all that springs from, and reverts to, germ; it belongs to *Maya*. The Great Breath, the Never-manifested, the Changeless, Consciousness-one are equipollent terms, whose attribute is Eternity, and which may be rendered by the expression GOD-ONE. Nothing that is subject to Time can ever merge in the Eternal; there is an abyss, so to speak, between one and the other, an impassable gulf. This does not imply that God is extra cosmic. God is not *at* the centre of any *thing*, but is *the centre* of every possible “centre”; yet, while no centre is immutable - save the real centre - and every centre will yield a deeper one, the *real* centre, how far soever the depth were carried, is never yielded, can never be reached - it may be compared to the case of asymptotical lines. There can be no contact between Eternity and what belongs to Time.

Therefore *phenomenal consciousness* has not the essence of CONSCIOUSNESS-ONE; it is only an *effect* of the latter. The *power* of phenomenal consciousness is in the indestructible germ. The Great Breath or Consciousness-one does not act *directly* on the germ - if it did there would never more be “germ”, for, as the *power* of germ is *illimitable*, the resultant phenomena would be *eternal* - that is to say, the Unmanifested would have communicated its *essence* (eternal *actuality*). But as the latter is never communicated, there must be something - which *we* would call a medium - intervening between eternal action and what is *latent*, but which nevertheless is not a medium - for a medium must partake of the essence of either term. And this intervening something must be *limited*, else the effect would stand for ever; and then adieu to phenomena whose essence is *change*.

...Now, that which *ever* and *only* is affected *directly* by the ceaseless act of the Eternal one, is FORCE in its *three* primeval modes. Force partakes neither of the essence of the One, nor of the essence of the Germ; but on one hand, governs the potencies of the latter, and on the other *falls* and *rises* (so to speak) according as equilibration of its three modes is receded from or approached - but however far it may recede from, or however near it may approach to, the plane of that action, it will never participate in its essence - and indeed such expressions (*distance* and *nearness*) are false, being only apparent, or due to the aspect forcibly taken by us. The effect of said action on the germ *through* Force, is *phenomenal consciousness*<sup>7</sup> and

---

<sup>7</sup> Which primordially is *conditioned* omniscience - *i.e.*, limited by the powers or scope of the cycle. (V. de F.)

*motion*. This, because of the disequilibrium of its three modes; and although the latter, as consciousness, is prior to motion in its *cause*, it is not so according to *time*, and the two phenomena are *simultaneous*.

In other words, the First Principle (Force) - sometimes called the Seventh - is manifested at the same time as the Second Principle (the *first* power of the germ) - sometimes called the Sixth Principle - whereby the two are for ever *inseparable* throughout the cosmic cycle. Strictly speaking the intervention in question is not identified in Force, as such; but (firstly) in the fact that a *perfect* equilibrium between the modes of Force is never attainable; and (secondly), as stated, in that Force is *limited* by its modes. Were a perfect equilibrium effected the postulate that Force is *increate* and *indestructible* - as much so as germ is - would have to be abandoned. The indestructibility of Force resides in the fact that the action of the Unmanifested is *ceaseless*, and that Force being limited by its primordial moods <sup>8</sup>, and no one mode being able to preponderate without a *medium* - whence there will always be *two* against *one*, alternately - no perfect or *absolute* equilibrium is verified (the so-called “perfect” equilibrium is only *relatively* so). Which means that one of the modes, at least, must at all times answer to the influence, or respond to the action, of the Great Breath, covertly when not manifestly - aye, even when pralaya culminates. It is by its *illimitable* action that the Unmanifested is the true preserver of the *limited* factor. Indestructibility of the *germ* has its proximate cause in the indestructibility of Force. Although *things* are finite, the *powers* of the germ - measured by the interminable series of cycles - are *infinite*; but entelecheia [*entelechy*] must be *limited*, an act which has passed from the potential is subject to limitation; and the immediate alterant cause is Force.

To go thoroughly into the subject would exceed the measure of an article, but if what has been submitted have any value, is it reasonable to suppose that a phenomenal plane or centre (including all that is realizable in man) can ever assimilate with the plane or centre of eternity? How can the human soul, nay, the very highest angel soul or mayavic god, ever be conceived to merge in the bosom of God-One? How imagine that anything should “tend to the perfection of Deity”? <sup>9</sup> or that “the Absolute is *essentially result*”?!

Aristotle, I opine, was ahead of Hegel and others, when advancing that essential energy belongs to God as his best and everlasting life (or, as commented on by Themistius, that nothing in God is *acquired*, quoted in Bohn’s ed.) and that the Deity is eternal and most excellent in nature (*Metaphys.* xi. 7, § 6), therefore *perfect*. If perfect, how in the name of Logic can Deity be perfectible?

---

<sup>8</sup> *Harmony* in motion, *Inertia* in motion, and *Activity* in motion - not to be mistaken for unmanifested “action” - three in one and one in three. Or two *positives* and a *neuter*, through which the dominion of one passes to the other, the latter meanwhile acting as the *negative* - a mere *aspect*, for the negative, as such, is non-extant; till the “neuter” as *radically* untrue as the negative - becomes in its turn a positive, namely the phase of attraction called *gravitation* - for it is only *one* phase of a *triple* fact, that is, *latent will*; the other two modes of attraction being *manifested will*, one now prevailing in *organic* states, whilst the third, as a dominant, is the compatibility of *super-organic* states. With the latter objection we concur heartily. (Note by Helena Blavatsky, the Editor)

<sup>9</sup> If, instead of Deity, *Gods* (plural) had been written, I would say *hear, hear!* (V. de F.)



### SECTION III

I submit that the reason why most systems of *exoteric* Philosophy run into Pantheism, when pushed to their logical conclusions - whether they belong to the Western or the Oriental school of thought - is because the argument rests on *Cosmic unity*. Whence the consequences: the Cause of causes is a *principle*, that which to some degree communicates its essence, or answers to the sum total of possibilities, in short, that which is *constitutive*, and not merely regulative. Among the Easterns the Night of Brahma is the period when *all* is dissolved, or on the way to dissolution; and the Day of Brahma, when *all* is in activity, or on the way to action.

It has been said the UNMANIFESTED BEING should not be meddled with. If so, we might as well accept the dogma of the Catholic Church - "believe and hold your tongue"! which makes it the most logical of all *churches*.

I take it that unless we strive to form a *sufficient* concept of the Great Unmanifested, it is *Metaphysics* that had better be left alone altogether.

To attain to a sufficient concept of the Unmanifested, we should, I think, commence by the proposition: the "Day" and "Night" (of Brahma) only affect phenomena, and in nowise God-One. That is, during the Day *individualities* and their correlations are in divers states of activity, actuality or manifestation, or advancing thereto; and during the Night in divers states of rest, potency or germ, or progressing thereto. Whereas, on the other hand, there is neither Day nor Night for God-One, which is always *action*, as never being in a potential state.

But then we should give up the notion that any period is *absolute*. Otherwise stated, *unity* is an exclusive attribute of the Unmanifested Being, and its action; whilst every period, however incommensurate, is only *relative*. Hence the Universe, in its aspect of *totality*, must not be considered as subject to *the same mode* of the Law in respect of Time and Space.

The totality is a composite of universes; a universe is a composite of solar systems; a solar system is a composite of worlds and so forth. A cosmic period would thus be referable only to *a single* universe, having its Day and Night, its *mahamanvantara* and *mahapralaya*, etc.

Consequently, there is *no period whatever* in which all is reduced to germ, and none where equilibrium is absolute. Albeit Time and Space (to say nothing of Matter, etc.) will cease as regards the *part* (meaning the process of a *change* in the *mode* of the Law, or the opening of a *new* period), Time and Space are always manifest in regard to the *totality*.

Yet Time and Space are neither absolute nor eternal; they have a beginning and an end relatively to a single Universe; whilst as mere symbols of *change*, they are not assimilable from Universe to Universe (*i.e.*, one universe cannot objectivise another).

A universe, *in posse*, will coincide with another or others *in esse*. Taking ours (all systems objectivisable by man, if he possessed the instrumental means) as the measure of comparison, there are universes which must be in advance, as there must be others less progressed.<sup>10</sup>

The *mahapralaya*, or “universal” dissolution of a universe, begins at that point of time when no new solar system is in evolution, that is, when all the archetypal potencies of that universe are come into manifestation, or have been actualized. Now, as all is subject to the law of the Spiral (which is a *necessity* having its cause in the three modes of Force, but would require a long digression to explain), while every sub-period is the analogue of another, no two are ever alike - this, from the very outset, which is *germ*, to the final close, which again is *germ*.

Consequently, the germ never constitutes a reversion to the same condition *precisely*, as that which conditioned it at the outset; the progress attained to is degree, and is only measurable by Maya - it is the resultant of “experiences” ..... This, likewise, would demand too much space to be sifted, and I merely wish to point out that it is the *powers* of the germ - and not Deity - which are “essentially *result*”, and which are *perfectible* (not in Reality, but under the law of *Maya*, which I have translated “Phenomenal Consciousness”).

To conclude. Space is not illimitable. Changes are illimitable. The chain of universes, and the series identifying each universe, are illimitable; but the phenomena (space, time, matter, etc., referable thereto) are *limited*. The *illimitedness* of such limitations is the only reality of phenomena, I mean, the only thing relating thereto which *does not change*. Withal it is not Reality, but its effect always *subsistent*. The Changeless (Reality, or the Unmanifested cause)

---

<sup>10</sup> This seems to me a logical conclusion, especially since the appearance of that luminous work, THE SECRET DOCTRINE. By a careful reading of the same it will be seen that matters have been wonderfully simplified on more than one point, and that what at first was incomprehensible - because apparently illogical - has been made clear if not evident. Now, taking a sectional view, this new light shows that a *planetary chain* (space and matter), a *manvantara*, (time and motion), and determined *human wave* (a given value of phenomenal consciousness, as I might express it) form three correlates of a certain line of evolution in its objectivity and subjectivity. The chain is a link in a sequence of chains, and that particular human wave will accompany the vicissitudes of the chains constituting the said line. This is but *one* of our solar system. Venus belongs to *another*, and will (comparatively speaking) soon cease to be a world, says the Master; whilst the Moon *was* the world of *our* line before the Earth took its place. Now, what does this tell us, if not that the *manifesting* world of one chain does not coincide as to Time, etc., with that of another; or in other words, that while some worlds are *in posse*, others are *in esse*, and that manifestation overlaps? Apply this to the universal scale, and it follows that there must *always* be a universe *in esse*, if not more than one, and that no *mahapralaya* is *absolute*. It shows likewise that the DIVINITY (ex-humanity) of our Universe will not only never merge in that of another, but also that it will never objectivise ALL that is *in esse*; and that it is as much bound by necessity to its own chain of universes, as the *adscripti* [servants in the Middle Ages, CCA] were to their soil. How childish then to hope to be lapped in the lap of the Eternal? How idle to talk of “immortality” otherwise than such as afforded by successive series of varied life-manifestation with their *respective* Nirvanas or Paranirvanas; that is to say, as anything save Duration in *change*!! (V. de F.)

and the Changeable are ever in presence. Spaces and periods are the objectivity of eternal subjectivity.

Phenomenal Consciousness is like a line that never meets another. If here, in the nether spheres, we are able to conceive that there must be such Another, rather such a “Beyond”, shall we not say that Consciousness, on soaring to its highest point (in *Maya*), must realize the fact *better* than we can, albeit TRUTH can never be realized?

Truth is as near our plane as it is to that height, for it is omnipresent - *Maya* is that which ever stands away from Truth. The difference, then, is this, namely, here we vaguely perceive the *necessity* of that Beyond; there, at the apogee of Consciousness, *knowledge* exists of such necessity; and it is believable such knowledge includes the *certainty* that the Beyond is *unattainable*. Speculation at one end, Certitude at the other. Why? Because, in proportion as mayavic Consciousness enlarges its horizon, the laws of *Maya* or Nature become more and more familiar to it, so that Consciousness ends by mastering all the laws, and every secret referable *to its cycle* (*i.e.*, to its universe, its time, its space, its circle of phenomena, etc.).

That knowledge, at the culmination of a great cosmic cycle <sup>11</sup>, to whatever time, etc. it belong, is the key to the arcanum, and discloses two supreme items: firstly, that the Beyond (which Consciousness *knows* to exist, but cannot fathom, nor objectivize) is forever *closed* to it; secondly, that it has reached the *nec plus ultra* of *its* time, but likewise that the *nec plus ultra* is nowhere for it is in relation to *all* times. (This refers to Humanity as a whole; but the *individual* may realize that knowledge long before the cycle ends, only .... very few *do*.)

There is nothing pessimistic in this.

In order to rise to that *certitude* man must merge in the bosom of mayavic (or subject) Divinity. We men aspire to eternity; in our blind idiocy nothing less will satisfy us. Divinity - ex-humanity - is resigned ..., it is not the word, *rejoices*; for it is at the pinnacle of Wisdom. It knows that to realize Eternity is not within the Law. It does not aspire to contradict; its happiness is to *know* that *it knows* such to be the Law; Ultimate truth must for ever remain sealed up and impenetrable to it. ... Such is PARANIRVANA, not of the schools, but logically interpreted.<sup>12</sup>

The end of a cosmic cycle must differ from its advent. Conditioned omniscience is not of the same nature at one juncture as at the other. At the opening, the manifestation first in order is

---

<sup>11</sup> That is, the so-called “unity”, or Cosmic Soul, pre-existing and post-existing (the extreme aspects), manifesting its true character, the *multiple* in abeyance. (V. de F.)

<sup>12</sup> Paranirvana, no less than Nirvana, belongs to Time, a Mahamanvantara at the longest. Is it not rather inconsistent in those who, on one hand, represent Nirvana or Paranirvana (the ultimate aim of Soul, or the Ego) to be an “eternal” state; and on the other hand, have it that the great cosmic cycle (*mahamanvantara*) is only one in a sequence without beginning and without end? This involves periodic *entrance* into, and *exit* from, Nirvana. Nothing that changes can ever be *eternal*. *Everything* that changes must perforce belong to Time, or rather to *times*. (V. de F.) [**Sub-note by H.P. Blavatsky**: This is just what one of the greatest of India’s mystic sons, the late Pundit and Swami, Dayanand Sareshvati taught, and just what occult philosophy teaches.]

*Resistance*; at its close, all is *Obedience*. That former phase means Happiness in Ignorance (want of “experiences”, still in contingency); the Peace of Innocence, followed by the Fall. The final phase is equivalent to Happiness in Knowledge and Wisdom; it is Redemption, and HARMONY in its loftiest aspect.

The exit from Nirvana or Paranirvana signifies the gradual unfolding of the germ, or re-manifestation of *individualities*. Entrance into that, or those states, is tantamount to the process by which individualities revert to germ. When this is accomplished, nothing of a Universe remains *manifest* save a grand centre of Phenomenal Consciousness. But that does not prevent other Universes being in existence; albeit Consciousness-one, the Eternal, can alone objectivize them.

(V. de F.)

000

The above article was published in the associated websites on 02 October 2020. It is also part of the September 2020 edition of “The Aquarian Theosophist”, pp. 04-14.

Click to see other writings by the Portuguese thinker [Visconde de Figanière](#), who was born on 02 October 1827.

000