

14 FRÖDING'S THEOSOPHY

¹In his biography of Gustaf Fröding, published in 1956, John Landquist wrote a section on "Fröding and the Theosophists". After all the unreliable things that are said about theosophy and are still spread and drummed into public opinion, it is increasingly necessary for esotericians to scrutinize such statements. There must be an end to that propaganda of lies.

²The writers demonstrate consistently that they have not mastered their subject, which appears from the fact that almost every assertion they make is erroneous in some respect. Landquist is one of those who have obviously tried to be objective and reliable. That he nevertheless failed should be clear from what follows.

³The majority of outsiders who write on theosophy mix it up with all sorts of things connected with spiritism, parapsychology, etc. This alone is characteristic of their ignorance and injudiciousness.

⁴Landquist's statement that Mrs Esperance "was later unmasked as an imposter" is, as Poul Bjerre pointed out, an unproved point. All mediums are imposters a priori according to science, which knows that the pertaining phenomena are impossible. An easy way to dodge that problem.

⁵Fröding's preconceived view on theosophy is best seen in the fact that he calls Blavatsky's work, *Isis Unveiled*, a "book of fairy tales" before reading it.

⁶None of the theosophical writers of whom Landquist says that Fröding studied them were in a position to make a satisfactory, acceptable presentation of theosophy.

⁷That is the first source of mistakes and erroneous statements about theosophy. When that knowledge which was taught in the secret knowledge orders was permitted for publication, they made the mistake (according to Laurency's view) of giving out disparate facts in a gradual fashion only. Instead they should have begun by presenting the Pythagorean hylozoic mental system. If they had done so, all those unreliable data that are still given out as theosophy and, even more, all those things said of theosophy, would have been made impossible from the very outset. Too many incompetent people became writers on a subject they were in no position to treat of. A sincere desire to do one's best is certainly not sufficient.

⁸Landquist says that "rupa-loka is a technical term from theosophical metaphysics ..." It means an intermediate state in devachan ..."

⁹The Sanskrit terms used by yoga philosophy are "kama loka" for the emotional world; "rupa loka", for the mental world; and "arupa loka", for the causal world.

¹⁰Landquist quotes Sinnett's statement on rupa loka in *Esoteric Buddhism*: "the world of forms – i.e., of shadows more spiritual, having form and objectivity, but no substance."

¹¹This statement alone indicates how little Sinnett comprehended, how a superior intellect at once thinks itself able to grasp it right, the whole of this irremediable enterprisingness of ignorance, which is the origin of the fictitiousness of our Western science and scholarship.

¹²Forms in the mental world consist of mental molecular matter of four different kinds. They are indeed no shadows (in her careless way of handling superphysical terminology Blavatsky called all superphysical material forms "shadows"). They radiate a light and an energy that would fell an emotional clairvoyant (all clairvoyance is emotional) who managed to catch a glimpse of it to the ground and blind him even physically.

¹³The allegation that "Mr Koot Hoomi" delivered such balderdash as to say that "it is the very monad that has lost its balance with itself and threatens to break up into atoms ..." must be attributed to Fröding's imagination.

¹⁴Landquist: "Despite much subjective fantasy there are bits of genuine Indian religion in Blavatsky's and Sinnett's theosophy." The ordinary superficial opinion on theosophy and the ordinary confusion of it with yoga philosophy.

¹⁵"Ideas from Indian philosophy in theosophy are the doctrines of karma, of the dream-state

after death, rebirths, the purification of mankind into pure spirituality up to Nirvana ...” The ordinary superficial opinion. The truth is that theosophy rejects all of those Indian doctrines. The law of sowing and reaping is no doctrine of “retaliation”. Life after death is no dream-state. The Indian conception of rebirth, metempsychosis, the notion that man can be reborn as an animal, has been opposed so vigorously by theosophy that Landquist should have been able to perceive at least that divergence. The acquisition of successively higher kinds of consciousness is something different from the “purification of mankind”.

¹⁶Landquist’s opinion that Max Müller’s lectures gave “more reliable information” about theosophy is as erroneous as all the other things he says.

¹⁷It is misleading to speak of the “relationship of theosophy to the Indian doctrine ...”, as Landquist does. It is perhaps a rather long price to ask that uninitiated reviewers should be able to see that yoga philosophy, too, contains remnants of the extremely old esoteric knowledge and that consequently theosophy and yoga evince many similar traits.

¹⁸Hilarious is undeniably Landquist’s proposition to the effect that “theosophy was, on the whole of it, a mild teaching of spiritual development – if you only make exception for Blavatsky’s angry attacks on materialists and scientists.” She could be harsh, and justly, for that is the only way of making people pay attention. But she never stooped to the mean tricks and infamies of scientists reminiscent of the “odium theologicum” of theologians.

¹⁹Landquist speaks of “Blavatsky’s ponderous and terrible prose ...” being ignorant of the fact that she had never expressed herself in English when she set about writing her *Isis*. Writing on esoterics, unploughed ground as it was, lacking a terminology for the realities concerned and being untutored in the language to be used – these conditions alone made her achievement a truly great feat. To put it plainly, she was not up to the job, which she admitted herself. She was able to account for facts without limit, but was in no position to make a system out of them, to present in a scientific fashion the subjects of which she treated. It will take hundreds of years to systematize the facts she gave out in *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine* and so make them comprehensible to philosophers and scientists. She was her own judge. *Isis* was published in 1877. Five years later she reread this book, which she had not even proofread. What she found horrified her, and she condemned the book in the harshest terms. Her written verdict is found in the journal *Lucifer* (London), in volume 8, on page 241.

²⁰Landquist’s chapter, “The Light of Akasha”, is as might have been expected of a treatment of this symbol, which nobody understood until 45-self D.K., in his capacity as the secretary of the planetary hierarchy, elucidated that matter as well as numerous other misunderstandings among the theosophists.

²¹After giving a few quotations from *Isis* on akasha – utterances that are totally incomprehensible to the uninitiated, as is so often the case in Blavatsky – Landquist deems it “better to retain the general impression of akasha as the heavenly light penetrating everything and containing the sources of all life”, if anyone understands this interpretation.

²²Cosmic matter consists of a series of kinds of matter that are of different degrees of density and interpenetrate. Each kind of matter is different from all the others with respect to dimension, duration, energy, consciousness, and laws. “Akasha” is term for world 44, atomic kind 44, or Indian paranirvana. The ignorant have expounded it as whatever their whims, passing fancies, imagination, etc. deemed suitable.

²³There are some remarkable points in Landquist’s chapter, “Atlantis”, too. We are told that the tale of Atlantis played “a great part in the theosophists’ history of the world” and that “this tale originates from Plato”.

²⁴“What Plato intended with his tale is not completely clear ...” The intimations he made were all he was permitted to say. Besides, he spoke only of the last remnant of Atlantis, the island of Poseidonis, which was submerged in the year 9564 B.C.E. The great continent of Atlantis, which partially appeared out of the Atlantic after the disappearance of Lemuria in the

Pacific about 4 242 000 years ago, comprised what is now Labrador and Iceland, Ireland, Scotland, the eastern and southern parts of the United States, Texas, the Mexican Gulf south towards Rio de Janeiro, etc. It split and sunk in four turns (about 800 000, 200 000, 75 025, and 9564 B.C.E.). That “tale” is found neither in Platon nor in Donnelly whom Landquist cites as Blavatsky’s sources. It is found, with raised maps, in the esoteric archive, which is accessible to those admitted to some one of the esoteric knowledge orders instituted by the planetary hierarchy, but not any one of the multitude of bogus orders.

²⁵Also the chapter, “The After-Death State”, needs to be commented upon, as everything the “uninitiated” have written on theosophy, for all but everything is distorted. It is swallowed by the readers as “scholarship” and is repeated by researchers through subsequent generations. It would be worthwhile to collect all this nonsense, particularly informative on how world history is written.

²⁶Landquist speaks of “Swedenborg and the new theosophists”. Swedenborg was no theosophist. He had picked up the imaginative constructions of the old Platonists. Add to this his emotional clairvoyance. The result was a hotch-potch of all manner of quasi-truths, a new religion. Connecting this with theosophy is typical of scholarly treatment.

²⁷What Sinnett states, that two people who loved each other would later in the mental world perceive each other’s thoughts telepathically, Landquist avers to be a “matter of pre-established harmony in the fashion of Leibniz between the two loving monads”. You could call that a “conception”: telepathy and “pre-established harmony” are said to be same thing.

²⁸The fifth chapter of seven on Fröding’s theosophy treats of “Monads, Planetary Selves, and Universal Selves”. The allegation to the effect that nirvana would be “a sublime condition of conscious rest in omniscience” is contradicted by esoterics according to which it is only in the superessential world (45) that the individual is in a position to understand what energy and will mean.

²⁹Landquist reports Sinnett’s astonishing misjudgement in the matter of the number of incarnations undergone during seven rounds (eons). His account of the “three active spiritual forces” (the monads, the planetary spirits, and “universal spirit which creates all life”) concerns what Sinnett grasped of esoterics, a highly deficient learning, as he later realized. It is unfortunate that such things as made up the first attempt at an esoteric world view are still invoked as theosophy. The latter underwent many transformations during the years 1875– 1920. And even its last presentation (that by Leadbeater) is characterized by D.K. as unsatisfactory.

³⁰What Fröding then made out of Sinnett’s speculation is another matter which can be safely passed over. As “Fröding fell prey to this mumbo-jumbo” with “these quick-change turns of the individual monad into universal self and planetary self”, the blame for this is cast upon the theosophists, of course. With his comments Landquist makes it clear how little he grasped of theosophy. What else might you expect?

³¹The last two chapters on Fröding’s theosophy are in the same vein. Once again the “Indian and theosophical doctrine of rebirth” are conjoined as if they were the same thing.

³²So much for that. The esoteric knowledge can never be given a final formulation. Just as scientific research is endless, this is true of esoterics as well. By the by through centuries and millennia we shall receive more and more facts about life in the worlds of our planet and about the cosmos. System upon system will see the light of day, containing more and more facts put into their right contexts. Never will any system contain all the facts. Nothing but summaries of ever more facts will be possible. It is already possible, however, to make deductive conclusions from the present system to an extent that more than enough satisfies man’s need for explanations of the nature, meaning, and goal of existence. There should be no need for saying that this requires the mastery of the Pythagorean hylozoic mental system, but it is regrettably necessary. We should probably deem illusory the hope of being spared further distortions of the esoteric knowledge in view of what has been achieved in that line during close on one hundred years.

The above text constitutes the essay *Fröding's Theosophy* by Henry T. Laurency.
The essay is part of the book *Knowledge of Life Five* by Henry T. Laurency, published in Swedish in 1995. Translation by Lars Adelskog.
Copyright © 2015 by the Henry T. Laurency Publishing Foundation.

Endnote by the Translator

14.1 Gustaf Fröding (1860–1911) was a Swedish major poet. John Landquist (1881–1974) was a Swedish literary critic and professor of pedagogy and psychology. As a matter of fact, Landquist wrote two biographies of Fröding, a shorter one (*Gustaf Fröding: en psykologisk och litteraturhistorisk studie*) in 1916 and a longer one (*Gustaf Fröding*) in 1956.