

The Wayback Machine - <https://web.archive.org/web/20211024052646/http://theos-talk.com/archives/200105...>



Theos-Talk Email List

[\[MASTER INDEX\]](#) [\[DATE INDEX\]](#) [\[THREAD INDEX\]](#) [\[SUBJECT INDEX\]](#) [\[AUTHOR INDEX\]](#)

[\[Date Prev\]](#) [\[Date Next\]](#) [\[Thread Prev\]](#) [\[Thread Next\]](#)

original versus Boris de Zirkoff editions of THE SECRET DOCTRINE

May 17, 2001 07:06 AM
by [Eldon B Tucker](#)

Peter:

At 12:11 PM 5/17/01 +0100, you wrote:

Hi Frank,

You make some good points in your post to Tony.

If I understand Tony correctly, I think he is suggesting that the photographs of the planets are simply about the exterior aspect of life, the exoteric, which can have a way of taking our attention away from the 'inner', the esoteric.

The inner side would consist, I'd think, of mind inspired by spirit, by buddhi-manas. That is thought with "something more". Anything that inspires, uplifts, or evokes deeper reflection would qualify in that sense. Anything that leads to intellectualism without the fire of spirit is exoteric.

I'm not sure that someone attracted to THE SECRET DOCTRINE, feeling an innate hunger for higher truths, would be misled by supplemental pictures or footnotes. They'd feel themselves pulled to the materials most suitable for their needs.

Any supplemental materials would be prone to getting out of date and tend to seem odd by today's standards. This includes the lengthy quotes and commentaries by Blavatsky on the misguided science of her era. That material may be of interest from an historical sense, but has nothing to do with timeless truths.

In reading THE SECRET DOCTRINE, we quickly become skilled at skimming over the deadwood so that we can pick out the references to timeless truths.

Tony seemed to be suggesting this is symbolic of the alterations that get made to HPB's texts by scholars who change the spelling, standardise the use of words, capitalisations, italics, even change words, phrases & so on.

I'm not sure that you'll find an esoteric truth in an misspelled Sanskrit word, something that may have resulted from an error in handwriting, proofreading, or typesetting.

In the many passages quoted in the book, there were a large number of errors. This was revealed by going back to the source materials that were quoted. I don't see anything esoteric in misquoting and prefer myself reading an edition of the book where the quotes were corrected.

That's all well and good from a purely exoteric point of view but do people take into account what may have been in HPB's mind from an esoteric and Occult point of view when she wrote what she wrote? I think this is the general point Tony is making.

The errors corrected were of a purely superficial nature, errors that detract from the accuracy and readability of the book. They were not intentionally made by Blavatsky after careful deliberation.

The heart of the book can be reached by reading between the lines, not by looking at how the lines are typeset. It can be found by tying together various threads of thought from different parts of the book -- like Dallas is good at -- rather than trying to find significance in particular spelling errors.

The timeless truths in the book remain the same, regardless of the edition that one prefers to read. I prefer an easier to read and more accurate edition of the book, feeling comfortable that the only changes were readily identifiable errors. Someone else, perhaps fearing that the editing went beyond that and obscured important ideas in the book, may prefer the original edition.

I can say that from my experience, in a study class that has gone through the entire first volume, where most in the class are using the original edition and I'm using Boris's edition, that I'm just as comfortable with the newer edition as I was when the class started. I've heard people reading from the original edition and followed in my copy of the book, and haven't seen the materials and ideas diverge, except when others were reading Blavatsky's quotes of the books of others.

-- Eldon

• Follow-Ups:

- [RE: Theos-World original versus Boris de Zirkoff editions of THE SECRET DOCTRINE](#)
 - From: "Tony" <alpha@dircon.co.uk>
- [RE: Theos-World original versus Boris de Zirkoff editions of THE SECRET DOCTRINE](#)
 - From: "Tony" <alpha@dircon.co.uk>
- [RE: Theos-World original versus Boris de Zirkoff editions of THE SECRET DOCTRINE](#)
 - From: dalval14@earthlink.net
- [RE: Theos-World original versus Boris de Zirkoff editions of THE SECRET DOCTRINE](#)
 - From: "Tony" <alpha@dircon.co.uk>

• References:

- [Re: Theos-World WHO PLAYED THAT TRICK ON H.P.B.? by Boris de Zirkoff](#)
 - From: "Frank Reitemeyer" <ringding@blinx.de>
- [RE: Theos-World WHO PLAYED THAT TRICK ON H.P.B.? by Boris de Zirkoff](#)
 - From: "Peter Merriott" <nous@btinternet.com>

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Theosophy World: Dedicated to the Theosophical Philosophy and its Practical Application