

Introduction

Existing translations of Vedic texts, however etymologically 'accurate', are too often unintelligible or unconvincing, sometimes admittedly unintelligible to the translator himself. Neither the 'Sacred Books of the East', nor for example such translations of the Upaniṣads as those of R.E. Hume, or those of Mitra, Roer, and Cowell, recently reprinted, even approach the standards set by such works as Thomas Taylor's version of the *Enneads* of Plotinus, or Friedländer's of Maimonides' *Guide for the Perplexed*. Translators of the Vedas do not seem to have possessed any previous knowledge of metaphysics, but rather to have gained their first and only notions of ontology from Sanskrit sources. As remarked by Jung, *Psychological Types*, p. 263, with reference to the study of the Upaniṣads under existing conditions, 'any true perception of the quite extraordinary depth of those ideas and their amazing psychological accuracy is still but a remote possibility'.

It is very evident that for an understanding of the Vedas, a knowledge of Sanskrit, *however profound*, is insufficient. Indians themselves do not rely upon their knowledge of Sanskrit here, but insist upon the absolute necessity of study at the feet of a *guru*. That is not possible in the same sense for European students. Yet Europe also possesses a tradition founded in first principles. That mentality which in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries brought into being an intellectual Christianity owing as much to Maimonides, Aristotle,¹ and the Arabs as to the Bible itself, would not have found the Vedas 'difficult'. For example, those who understood that 'Paternity and filiation . . . are *dependent* properties', or that God 'cannot be a Person without a Nature, nor can his Nature be without a Person', Eckhart, I.268 and 394,² or had read later Dante's 'O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son', *Paradiso*, xxxiii, would not have seen in the mutual generation of Puruṣa and Virāj, or Dakṣa and Aditi an arbitrary or primitive mode of thought: those familiar with Christian conceptions of Godhead as 'void', 'naked', and 'as though it were not', would not have been disconcerted by descriptions of That as 'Death' (*mṛtyu*), and as being 'in no wise' (*nehi, neiti*). To those who even to-day have some idea of what is meant by a 'reconciliation of opposites', or have partly understood the relation between man's conscious consciousness and the *unconscious* sources of his powers, the significance of the Waters as an 'inexhaustible well' of the

¹One of our most ancient philosophers who found the truth long, long before God's birth, ere ever there was Christian faith at all as it is now, Eckhart, I.103. Cf. Note 60.

²Except where otherwise stated, references to Eckhart are to C. de B. Evans' admirable version in two volumes, London, 1924.

possibilities of existence might be apparent. When Blake speaks of a 'Marriage of Heaven and Hell', or Swinburne writes, 'I bid you but be', there is included more of the Vedas than can be found in many learned disquisitions on their 'philosophy'. What right have Sanskritists to confine their labours to the solution of linguistic problems: is it fear that precludes their wrestling with the ideology of the texts they undertake? Our scholarship is too little humane.³

What I have called here a 'new approach to the Vedas' is nothing more than an essay in the exposition of Vedic ideas by means of a translation and a commentary in which the resources of other forms of the universal tradition are taken for granted. Max Müller, in 1891, held that the Veda would continue to occupy scholars 'for centuries to come'. Meanwhile there are others beside professional scholars, for whom the Vedas are significant. In any case, no great extension of our present measure of understanding can be expected from philological research alone, however valuable such methods of research may have been in the past: and what is true for Sumero-Babylonian religion is no less true for the Vedas, viz., that 'further progress in the interpretation of the difficult cycle of . . . liturgies cannot be made until the cult is more profoundly interpreted from the point of view of the history of religion'.⁴

As regards the translation: every English word employed has been used advisedly with respect to its technical significance. For example, 'nature' is here always the correlative of 'essence', and denoted that whereby the world is as it is; never as in modern colloquial usage to denote the world, *as naturata*. Similarly, existence is distinguished from being, creation from emanation, local movement from the principle of motion, the incalculable from the infinite, and so forth. All that is absolutely necessary if the sense of the Vedic texts is to be conveyed. In addition, the few English words added to complete the sense of the translation are italicized: and when several English words are employed to render one Sanskrit term, the English words are generally connected by hyphens, e.g. Āditya, 'Supernal-Sun'; Akṣara, 'Imperishable-Word'.

As regards the commentary: here I have simply used the resources of Vedic and Christian scriptures side by side. An extended use of Sumerian, Taoist, Sūfī, and Gnostic sources would have been at once possible and illuminating, but would have stretched the discussion beyond reasonable limits.⁵ As for the

³On the one hand, the professional scholar, who has direct access to the sources, functions in isolation: on the other, the amateur propagandist of Indian thought disseminates mistaken notions. Between the two, no provision is made for the educated man of good will.

⁴Langdon, S., *Tammuz and Ishtar*, Oxford, 1914, p. v.

⁵It is not without good reason that Jahāngīr speaks of 'the science of the Vedānta which is the science of Sufism', *Tazuk-i-Jahāngīr*, translated by Rogers and Beveridge, I, p. 356. Parallels to almost all the ideas discussed below could be adduced from Islamic theology: see especially Nicholson, R.A., *Studies in Islamic mysticism*, 1921, and

Vedic and Christian sources, each illuminates the other. And that is in itself an important contribution to understanding, for as Whitman expresses it, 'These are really the thoughts of all men in all ages and lands, they are not original with me. If they are not yours as much as mine, they are nothing, or next to nothing.' Whatever may be asserted or denied with respect to the 'value' of the Vedas, this at least is certain, that their fundamental doctrines are by no means singular.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
December 1932

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY

Macdonald, D.B., *The development of the idea of spirit in Islam*, Acta Orientalia, IX, 1931. It may be noted that the ontology of a non-Christian tradition has been competently discussed by these authors in a way that has never been attempted by any professional European student of the Vedas.

Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 2
(= Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa X, 6, 5)

In the beginning (*agre*) no thing whatsoever was here. This-all (*idam*) was veiled by Death (*mṛtyu*), by Privation (*āsanāyā*): for Privation is Death. That (*tad*) took-on (*akuruta*) Intellect (*manas*), 'Let me be Selfed' (*ātmanvī-syām*). He (*sah*), Self, manifested Light (*arcam acarāt*). Of Him, as he shone, were the Waters (*āpah*) born (*jāyanta*). Verily, whilst I shone, there was Delight' (*kam*), said-He (*itā*). This is the Sheen (*arkatva*) of Shining (*arka*). Verily, there is delight for him who knoweth thus the sheen of shining. 1.

Our text deals with the origin of Light from Darkness, Life from Death, Actuality from Possibility, Self from the Un-selfed, *saguṇa* from *nirguṇa* Brahman, 'I am' from Unconsciousness, God from Godhead. 'The first formal assumption in Godhead is being . . . God', Eckhart, I.267. 'The Nothing bringeth itself into a Will', Böhme, *XL Questions concerning the Soule*, I.178: 'an eternal will arises in the nothing, to introduce the nothing into something, that the will might find, feel, and behold itself', *Signatura Rerum*, I.8. 'The Tao became One', *Tao Tē Chung*, II.42.⁵

⁵A distinction of existence from pure being is easily made: 'being in itself is modeless, 'existence' is being in a mode. Essence and nature, *per se*, are evidently non-existent: it need scarcely be added that this 'non-existence', viz., the absence of properties, has nothing in common with the non-existence of the absurd or self-contradictory, for example, a square circle; it is not illogical, but alogical, or ineffable, all that can be said of it being purely analogical. Nevertheless, the practical use of the terms Non-being, Being, and Existence, presents real difficulties.

We understand Non-being and Being to be correlative aspects, the inseparable Nature and Essence, of Brahman, the Supreme Identity, not yet existent, antecedent to procession, *solus ante principium*, *aspraveritū*, *Kauṣītaki Up.*, IV.8: and understand Existence to include all multiplicity, whether nominal and informal, or real and formal. Non-being is the permissive principle, first cause, of Being: Being the permissive principle, first cause, of Existence. Thus:

Asat	Non-being (<i>avyakta</i>) Being (<i>vyakti-avyakta</i>)	anātmya param-ātman	nirguṇa, amūrta, akāla	Brahman satya
Sat	Existence (<i>vyakta</i>)	pratyag-ātman (Viśve Devāh, visvā bhuvanāni)	saguṇa, mūrta, kāla, sthita, martya	

Compare *Taittirīya Uṅ.*, II.7 *svayam akuruḥ ātmānam* 'of itself assumed Self', and *svayambhū*, 'self-become', Upaniṣads *passim*: *Maitrī Uṅ.*, V.2 and II.5, 'In the beginning this world was a Dark-Inert (*taṃas*) . . . that proceeds to differentiation (*viśvamatva*) . . . even as the awakening of a sleeper.' That is Eckhart's 'passive welling up': 'the beginning of the Father is primary, not proceeding', 'the Father is the manifestation of the Godhead', I. 268, 267 and 135. Just as also, microcosmically, 'Without a doubt, consciousness is derived from the unconscious' (Wilhelm and Jung).

Now as to 'One': an intelligible distinction can be made between the innumerable Unity of God 'without a second', the Sameness of Godhead, and the Identity, Deity, of God and Godhead, *mūṛta* and *amūṛta* Brahman: 'between the pillars of the conscious and unconscious . . . all beings and all worlds', Kabir, Bolpur ed. II.59: 'One and One uniting, there is the Supreme Being', Eckhart, I.368. That these are here 'rational, not real' distinctions (Eckhart, I.268) appears in the fact that 'One' can be spoken equally of Unity, Sameness, and Identity: God, Godhead, Deity, is not a distinction of Persons. On the other hand, 'One' cannot be said of the Trinity as such. These distinctions, necessarily and clearly made in exegesis, when literally interpreted, become definitions of sectarian points of view, theistic, nihilistic, and metaphysical: in *bhakti-vāda* the Unity, in *śūnya-vāda* the Sameness, in *jñāna-vāda* the Identity are respectively *pāramārthika*, ultimately significant. In Śākta cults there survives an ontology antedating patriarchal modes of thought, and the relation of the conjoint principles is reversed (*viparīta*) in gender: here Śiva, inert, effecting nothing by himself, represents the Godhead, while Sakti, Mother of All Things, is the active power, engendering, preserving, and resolving, *ilā* is not 'his' but 'hers'. In 'mysticism' there is an emotional realization of all or any of these points of view. In reality, 'the path men take from everyside is mine', *Bhagavad Gītā*, IV.11, 'In whatever way you find God best and are most aware of him that way pursue', Eckhart, I.482.

It should be observed further that while we speak in theology⁸ of First, Second, and Third Persons, the Persons being connected (*bandhu*, *Rgveda*, X.129.4, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṅ.*, I.1.2) by opposite relation,⁹ the numerical

It follows that *asaṁ* can be rendered correctly either as Non-being or as Non-existence: *saṁ* either as Being or as Existence, as may best suit the context. The problem arises only in connection with 'Being': if we render *asaṁ* and *saṁ* as Non-being and Being, then, *saṁ* must cover both being in itself and Being in a mode. The terms are further discussed below, pp. 85-6.

⁸Not that these are commensurable terms: Theistic and Nihilistic points of view are partial, and therefore in apparent opposition, as for example in the case of Śaivism and Buddhism; while Metaphysics, *jñāna-vāda*, underlies, justifies, and embraces all other points of view.

⁹From the Vedic point of view, 'angelology' would be more accurate.

¹⁰On this 'kinship' depends the 'incestuous' character of so many myths of creation. It should be observed that the term 'myth' property implies the symbolic (verbal, iconographic or dramatic) representation of the operation of power or energy.

ordering of the Persons is purely conventional (*samketita*), not a chronological or real order of coming into being: for the Persons are consaccnt, *itaretarjanyamāna*, the Trinity (*tridhā*) is an arrangement (*samhitā*), not a process. For example, the Son creates the Father as much as the Father the Son,¹⁰ for there can be no paternity without a filiation, and *vice versa*, and that is what is meant by 'opposite relation'. Similarly, there cannot be a Person (Puruṣa) without Nature (Prakṛti), and *vice versa*. That is why in metaphysical 'mythology' we meet with 'inversions', as for example, when in the *Rgveda*, X.72.4, Dakṣa (a personal name of the Progenitor, see *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, II.4.4.2) is born of Aditi as her son, and she also of him as his daughter; or X.90.5, where Virāji is born of Puruṣa, and *vice versa*. Metaphysics are consistent, but not systematic: system is found only in religious extensions,¹¹ where a given ordering of the Persons becomes a dogma, and it is precisely by such 'matters of faith', and not by a difference of metaphysical basis, that one religion is distinguished from another. That is truly a 'distinction without a difference.'

It should be observed that the consaccntence (*sahajanya*) of Father-essence and Mother-nature, the 'two forms' of Brahman, though metaphorically spoken of as 'birth' (*janma*), is not a sexual-begetting, not a generation from conjoint principles, *maithunya prajanya*: in that sense both are equally unborn, un-born, as in *Śvetāśvatara Uṅ.*, I.8. *dāvājavau*, or as implied in the

protons and electrons in this sense are 'mythical' beings. A myth, such as the Grail myth, or the Birth of Brahmā, is neither a 'fairy tale' nor a 'mystery' in the modern sense of the words, but simply a presentation. He who regards the myth or icon as a statement of fact, and he who regards it as fantasy, are equally misled: myth is to history as universal to particular, *raison d'être*, to *l'être* icon to species as exemplar to instance. Symbolism and imagery (*prasthā*, *pratibimba*, etc.), the purest form of art, is the proper language of metaphysics: the symbol always presupposes that the chosen expression is the best possible description, or formula, of a relatively unknown fact . . . which is none the less known or postulated as existing' (Jung). Traditional symbolism is also more nearly a universal language than any other; the greater part of its idiom is the common property and inheritance of nearly all peoples, and can be traced back at least to the fifth or sixth millennium BC (cf. Winckler, *Die babylonische Geisteskultur*, 1907; Jeremias *Handbuch des altorientalischen Geisteskultur*, 1929 and Langdon, *Semitic mythology*, 1931), and to the beginnings of agriculture or there beyond.

¹⁰Cf. 'He hath brought me forth His son in the image of His eternal fatherhood, that I should also be a father and bring forth Him', Eckhart, Claud Field's *Sermons*, p. 26; cf. Jñi, cited by Nicholson, *Studies* . . . p. 112, 'I am the child whose father is his son, and the wine whose vine is its jar . . . I met the mothers who bore me, and I asked them in marriage, and they let me marry them.' 'The Snake's Bull-Father—the Bull's Father-snake' is cited by Harrison, *Prolegomena* . . . p. 495, from frg. ap. Clem (ent) of Al (alexandria), *Protr.*, I.2.12. Or again, of Agni, 'being the Son of the Angels, thou hast become their Father', *Rvāda*, I.69. 1: Agni is the father of his father', *ibid.*, VI.16.35, and 'whoever understands this (*yastā vijāna*) is his father's father', i.e. surpasses his father.

¹¹Also, of course, in science, 'philosophy', psychology, and other 'practical' disciplines.

Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṇ., I.4.3 where the origination of the conjoint principles called a 'falling apart', diremption, or karyokinesis, *dvedhā-pāta*. 'One became Two', viz., Yin and Yang, *Tao Tz' Ching*, II.42.

On the other hand, their common Son, Agni Brahmā-Prajāpati, etc., being consubstantial with the Spirit (*prāṇa*) is at once unborn in the same sense, and born by a generation from the conjoint principles.¹³ Only the latter birth can be thought of as an 'event' taking place at the dawn of a creative cycle, in the beginning, *agra*.

With respect to *kāma*, 'Delight', 'Affirmation': Will (*kāma*) or Fiat (*syād*) are the moving power (*lakṣa*, *reviṇa*) in all procession (*krama*, *prasarana*), *kāma* is the will-to-life, 'so great indeed is *kāma*', *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṇ.*, I.4.17. Will, *kāma*, is an essential name of God; it is by his Will that his intrinsic-form (*svarūpa*) signs and seals intrinsic-nature (*svabhāva*), Nature for her part desiring form. So the single Will in Deity may be regarded from two points of view, with respect to essence as the Will-spirit, and with respect to nature as the Craving¹⁴; as Gandharva and Apsaras (= Urvaśi, *Rgveda*, VII.33.11, and *Apyā*, X.13.4, Kāmadeva and Rati, Eros and Psyche; cf. *Viṣṇu Purāna*, I.8.20 and 33, where Nārāyaṇa is 'love' (*kāma*, *lobha*, *rāga*) and Śrī-Lakṣmī is 'desire' (*icchā*, *trṣṇā*, *rati*).

These two aspects of the Will are plainly seen in the Vedic 'legend' of the 'Hence the constant use of essential names common to both, a certain indistinction of Father and Son, the distinction of Person being lost in their unity of Godhead, of the common nature.

¹³ Thus, antecedent to procession:

Person (Father)—Spirit (Will)—Nature (Mother)
and posterior to procession:
Person (Father)—Nature (Mother)
 \ Spirit (Son, Life) /

¹⁴ See Böhme, *Mysterium Panophaicum*, I-III. Only when the Will is dually personified as Kāmadeva and Rati can it be said that the Will-spirit and the Craving are actually distinguished: elsewhere, either *kāma* represents the Will as an undivided principle, or we must understand from the context *what* will is implied. In our text, especially vv. 1 and 4, where it is Death, Privation, Godhead, that wills (*syām*, *akāmayat*)—a thing that can only be conceived analogically in the Not-Self—we must understand it is not the Will-spirit (*kāma*, *libido*, 'libet'), but the Craving (*trṣṇā*, coveting, fatality, that which 'draws a man on' when he is 'fey'); that is the desire of Nature (*prakṛti*) for intrinsic form (*svarūpa*), the ardour of the Waters 'in their season', *Pañcaviṅśa Brāhmaṇa*, VII.8.1, an unconscious, functional, dark will-to-life. In X.129.4 (p. 79) on the other hand, where *kāma* is identified with the 'primal seed (*retas*) of Intellect (*manas*)'—not, i.e. the germinal source of Intellect, but the germinal aspect of Intellect, *logos spermaticos*, the *rasa* of *Rgveda*, I.164.8—the light Will-spirit is clearly implied. The two wills are immediately correlated and perfectly balanced in unitary being: representing His knowledge of himself (in both senses of the verb to 'know'). In other words, the movement of the Will-spirit towards its object is the 'answer' to the unspoken 'wish' of the unconscious, as in *Rgveda*, I.164.8, 'He by Intellect forewent her.' These considerations seem to solve the difficulties felt by Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Vedas*, p. 436.

Birth of Vasiṣṭha,¹⁵ and the *Pañcaviṅśa Brāhmaṇa* passage cited below, p. 36. In the first case Mitra-Varuṇau is quite literally seduced by the fascinations, of the Apsaras Urvaśi; in the second, the Waters are literally 'in heat'. God

¹⁵ *Rgveda*, VII.33.11, *Bṛhad Devatā*, V.148 and 149, and *Sarvāmukramanī*, I.166: the child begotten of Mitṛā-Varuṇau and the Waters is Vasiṣṭha, who like Brahmā makes his appearance upon a lotus, i.e. is established in the Waters, in the possibility of existence, and who is in fact the same as Brahmā-Prajāpati, as rightly identified in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, II.4.4.2, cf. *Nirukta*, V.1.4. Hence Vasiṣṭha's patronymic Maitrāvṛuṇi. Again in the *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*, II.2.1 and 2, Vasiṣṭha and other 'sages' are identified in various ways with the progenitive Person and the positive existence of all things. In *Atharvaveda*, X.8.20, the expression 'churned forth' (*nirmānākatā*), appropriate to Agni, is used of Vasu (=Vasiṣṭha). The name Vasiṣṭha (superlative of *vasu*) seems to be rightly understood by the Commentators to mean 'foremost of those who dwell, exist, or live', either from root *vas* 'to assume a form', or root *vas* 'to live', or 'abide in a given condition'. *Vasu* is also derivable from root *vaso* to shine, giving the secondary meaning 'wealth'. Whatever the root, the meanings are not incompatible, inasmuch as to be undigested of life or existence is the primary 'good'. Cf. Vasudhā, Vasudhārā, Earth as 'Mistress of Wealth', 'Habundia', or 'Upbearer of Life' (Vasudhā also = Lakṣmī); and Vasudhara, Kṛṣṇa as 'Lord of Life' in relation to Rādhā, where both meanings are implied.

Like Vasiṣṭha, Agni (Vaiśvānara) is born of, literally 'churned from' a lotus, i.e. the Earth, *Rgveda*, VI.16.13. That is, as the element of Fire and as Sacrificial fire in the Three Worlds: for Agni as the Supreme Deity is the 'Father', being like Mitṛā-Varuṇau seduced by the Waters, *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, I.1.3.8, and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, II.1.1.4 and 5. Needless to point out that Mitṛā-Varuṇau, Sun, Fire, Spirit, etc., are all denotations of one and the same first principle of manifestation, and that the Waters, often called the wives of Varuṇa, or mothers in relation to the Son (Kumāra, Agni Vaiśvānara), are the possibilities of manifestation.

Parallel to the passages cited above is the myth of Purūravas and Urvaśi, *Rgveda*, X.95 (also IV.2.12 and 18), and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, XI.5.1; their son Āyu, 'Life', is identified in the *Vejāsaneyi Samhitā*, V.2, with Agni, Fire. Purūravas evidently corresponds to Prajāpati, the 'first sacrificer', cf. how in the ŚBr: passage he brings fire to earth by performing the (first) sacrifice, that is after he has lain again with Urvaśi on 'the last night of the year' subsequent to their first intercourse, that means a year of supernal time, the duration of one cycle of manifestation, the 'Year' of our Upniṣad. By the sacrifice, he who had been 'changed in form' and 'walked amongst mortals', and was thus divided from Urvaśi (manifestation, or existence necessarily implying a diremption of essence and nature) he becomes a Gandharva, and is reunited with Urvaśi, that is he becomes again the pure Will-spirit in union with its object. Thus he has proceeded in time, and now returns to the unmanifest at the end of time. Thus also Purūravas corresponds to Aditya (Vivasvat): Āyu may be compared to Manu Vaivasvata. The 'mortality' of Purūravas does not mean that Purūravas was 'a man', but belongs to his existence as Universal Man, *soguna*, *marītya* Brahman. That all this was clearly understood is shown in connection with the Soma sacrifice, when in the ritual of making fire, the upper and the lower twirling-sticks are addressed as Purūravas and Urvaśi, the pan of *ghṛi* (the food of the sacrificial fire, whereby it exists) as Āyu, 'for Urvaśi was the Apsaras, Purūravas her Lord, from their intercourse was Āyu born, and now in like manner he (the sacrificer) brings forth the sacrifice from their union', *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, III.4.1.22.

thus affirms himself because it is his nature so to come forth: existence is his knowledge of himself, that is his eating of the fruit of the tree, for to eat is to exist. In other words, the possibility of existence necessarily involves the fact

The relations between Vivasvat (the mortal Sun) and Saranyū (in person or represented by a *savaritā*) are the same as those of Purūravas and Urvaśī: Āyu corresponding to Yama-Yami, Manu and the Aśvins.

It may be added that *rauas* in Purūravas, and Ravi, 'Sun', are from the same *√ra* to 'roar'; the notion being that of the roaring of the Cosmic Fire (*Rgveda*, V.2.10), which is the purring of the World-Wheel, the Music of the Spheres. Cf. *Maṅgī Uṅ.*, II.6 (c).

Note that the designation of the upper fire-stick, *pramantha*, corresponds to 'Prometheus'. The correspondence between the myths of Purūravas and Urvaśī and Eros and Psyche is evident. Prometheus is post-Homeric, the myth of Eros and Psyche only in Apuleius: *pra-√math* occurs first in Smṛti, corresponding to *nir-√math* in Vedic usage. The importance of Fire and Water in early Greek philosophy may well reflect Oriental, that is immediately, Persian influences, cf. Harrison, *Themis*, 1927, p. 461. It may be noted that the correspondence of Prometheus with *pramantha* is far more than merely etymological. Prometheus, like Agni, is the child of Earth, and the Okeanids who sympathize with him (in the Prometheus of Aeschylus) are his blood-kin, for the birth of Fire on Earth is but one remove from his source in the Waters. Like Urvaśī, these Okeanids appear to him in the form of birds; and 'Okeanos is much more than Ocean'.

As for the diremption of essence and nature (represented in our myths by Purūravas and Urvaśī, Eros and Psyche), cf. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, I.1.3.2. 'The sky and earth were close together. On being divided, they said, etc.', with the famous fragment of Euripides (Nauck, fig. 484): Cf. *RV*, I.164.8-9, X,124.8 and *JUB*, III.14.)

Heaven and Earth were once one form, but stirred

And then rewedding, bore unto the day

And light of life all things that are . . .

. . . each in his kind and law,

and the later echo in *Apollonius Rhodius*, I.494, 'how that they parted after deadly strife

asunder, etc.'

For a comparative treatment of the whole theme see Siecke, E., *Die Liebesgeschichte des Himmels*, Strassburg, 1892.

Amongst the proposed derivations of *apsaras*, that which gives the sense 'moving on the Waters' is to be preferred, but *apsu-rasa*, 'savour of the Waters' is also possible, and a third derivation from *a-√psā*, implying 'forbidden food', also suggested by Yaska, is not without interest. Vedic *Apsaras* and *Gandharva* are a single pair; the former, by name *Urvaśī* ('wide-pervasive') is a persona of Aditi, later represented as Śrī-Lakṣmī, the latter equivalent to *Kandarpa*, *Kāmadeva*. In any case, the *Apsaras* represents the fascination of the possibilities of existence, to which the Will, *Gandharva*, responds: their mutual relation is the *causa causans* of the movement of the world. It is again as Will that the *Gandharva* holds the bridle of the cosmic steed, i.e. *Varuṇa*, *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, IV.6.7, and *Rgveda*, I.163.3.

Observe that *nirukta* is not 'etymology', but 'interpretation', 'ermühevila'. Yaska never had in view the special science of (philology, and it is merely 'unscientific' to speak of his 'derivations' as 'false etymologies'. Neither is *nirukta* merely 'exegetis'

of existence: that is precisely His omnipotence who is without (unrealized) potentialities and is never idle though he never works. Nor does he act unwittingly, he drinks the poison (*viśa*) and objectivity (*viśamaitā*) of existence as well as its delights; whereby his throat is scorched and blackened.

It will be seen that no real distinction can be drawn in principle between the Fall of God and that of Man: both are the necessary consequences of a divine nature common to both. The sin and shame, the virtue and glory of existence are his as much as ours.¹⁶ The difference between us is that he knowingly remains within at the same time that he comes forth Self-ishly, we are conscious *only* in our 'self'. He is a tide at once fontal and inflowing: we are its waves, oblivious that wave is water too. Our only error is to see distinction here: the Comprehensor, *ya evaṁ vidvān*, knowing himself no more as wave, but as the sea him-Self, returns with the tide to its source, which neither he nor the Supreme Self have ever really, but only logically, left.

The Will proceeds as Love, 'by way of the Will as Love', St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, I, Q. 36, A. 2; that 'mutual outpouring of love . . . is the common spiration of the Father and the Son', Eckhart, I.269. 'We desire a thing while as yet we do not possess it. When we have it, we love it, desire then falling away', Eckhart, I.82¹⁷; but as there is nothing that he does not possess in himself, who does not proceed from potentiality to act, but is all act, his will is his love, 'Eternity is in love with the productions of time', Blake, cf. *Rgveda*, VII.87.2. That is his affirmation and delight, *kaṁ, ānanda*, 'God enjoys himself in all things . . . finding his reflection most delightful', Eckhart, I.243 and 425, cf. *pramudam prajāti*, Śaṅkarācārya, *Svātmānirūpaṇa*, 95.

Veda neither asserts a beginning in time, nor a creation *ex nihilo*.¹⁸ 'In the beginning' does not mean 'at a given time', nor eventually, but in an ever-present now, of which empirical experience is impossible, human knowledge being only of the past, and human expectation only of the future: *agre* is first in order, primordial, *in principio*, rather than first in time. 'In the beginning, this world was merely Water', *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṅ.*, V.5.1: that is to say all the possibilities of existence, not yet existence, but not an impossibility of

(concrete interpretation), but rather 'anagogic. Examples of *nairukta*, 'hermeneutic', interpretation would be (1) to correlate Grk. *pro batikrov* with Lat. *probans*, in the sense to 'prove', 'make good', (2) to compare A and OM with Alpha and Omega, (3) to explain *amoras a-mor = amrita*. At the same time nothing hinders that *nirukta* may in certain cases accord with 'true etymology'.

¹⁶Or as expressed by Jñi, while religion (dualism) distinguishes ice (the universe) from water (God), understanding (monism) realizes their identity (Nicholson, *Studies* . . . p. 99).

¹⁷Cf. Jñi's 'nine phases of will, beginning with inclination (*mayā*) and ending with the highest and purest love (*iśhā*) in which there is no (distinction of) lover or beloved', Nicholson, *Studies* . . . p. 102.

¹⁸Cf. *Bhagavad Gītā*, II.12 and XIII.19: Śaṅkarācārya, Comment on the *Vedānta Sūtra*, II.1.35, *anāditvātsamsārayas*; and Dante, 'not before nor after was the procession of God's outflowing over these waters', but 'where every where and every when is focussed', *Paradiso*, XXIX.19.20 and 21.

existence, a true nothing, to be compared to the horns of a hare or the son of a barren woman. To say that the world was not, that there was no thing, or as in Genesis that all was 'without form and void', is not to say that nothing was. What was, is called *pradhāna, mūla-prabhīti*, the Waters, Dark-Inert (*amas*), and by many other names: what was not is the world, life, existence, multiplicity, variety, *ens naturata*, the Three Worlds.

As to the conception of Godhead in our text: Mṛtyu, Death, is lifelessness, and lifelessness, in the technical phraseology of St. Thomas, is 'lack of an intrinsic form', *Sum. Theol.*, II, Q. 6, A. 2 'A prodigy, and is not being . . . (but) prior to motion and prior to intelligence', Plotinus, *Enneads*, VI.9.6. So the Godhead, Death-absolute, is also called privation: for 'That' is 'the unexpounded (*anirukta*), invisible (*adrśya*), not-selfed (*anātmya*), placeless (*anulayana*) ground (*pratiśṭhā*)', *Taittirīya Uṅ.*, II.7. 'Nothing true can be spoken of God'; 'God is neither this nor that', 'Know'st thou of him anything? He is no such thing', Eckhart, I.87.211 and 246: 'which hath no ground or byss to stand on, and where there is no place to dwell in . . . it may fitly be compared to nothing', Böhme, *Supersensual Life*. Such a negative manner of speaking is inevitable: for here negation, *netā, netī*,²⁰ 'not so, not thus', is a denial of limiting conditions, a double negative; not as with us, who 'make innate denial' that we are other than ourselves, an affirmation of limiting conditions. So godhead is 'void', 'light and darkness, it is rid of both', 'poised in itself in sable stillness', it is 'idle', 'effects neither this nor that', is 'as poor, as naked, and as empty as though it were not; it has not, wills not, wants not', 'motionless dark', Eckhart, I.267-70, 368, 369, 381.²¹

¹⁹Mṛtyu as Death-absolute, the last death of the soul, *mors janua vitae*, is to be distinguished from death-temporal, *mṛtyu*, or *pinar mṛtyu*; which distinction is, for example, sharply drawn in the seventh stanza of our Brāhmana.

It is developed later, p. 56, that the relation of Godhead to God, *niṅgupa* Brahman (Mṛtyu in our text), is as it were maternal, a relation of Aditi to Āditya. Observe then that corresponding to the conception in our text of *niṅgupa, anātmya* Brahman as Death-absolute is that of Aditi as Nirṛti, as in *Rgveda*, VII.58.1, where the Maruts rise up, grow up, into the regions of angelhood (*dāvasya dhāmanah*) from the abyss of Nirṛti (*nirṛtavamśāt*)—the metaphor contrasts *dhāman* in the sense of 'abode', 'dwelling', having an implied structure, with that which is not an abode, not a dwelling, but without structure, literally 'devoid of any beam', *avamśa*, and 'unsupported by any pillar', *astambha*.

Dāvasya dhāman here corresponds to *aśvara* . . . *dhāma parama*, imperishable, transcendental abode', *Bhagavad Gītā*, VIII.21.

²⁰The Self is neither this nor that (*netī, netā*): unseizable, indestructible, unrelated, etc.' *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṅ.*, IV.4.22.

Cf. also Dante, *Convivio*, III. 15, ' . . . certain things which our intellect cannot behold . . . we cannot understand what they are except by denying things of them'.

The same argument is developed in Maimonides, *Guide for the Perplexed*, I.59.

²¹All this exactly corresponds to the Muhammadan conception of the Godhead as al'Amā, 'dark mist', 'blindness', 'unconsciousness', immanent negativity, 'potentiality', 'non-existence', etc., all logically contrasted with Abaddiya, the transcendental Unity of Allāh (Nicholson, *Studies* . . . pp. 83-97).

Aśanāyā, want, is privation of 'food', the means of existence. So in the language of the Upanisads, 'to eat food', *annam ad*, is to 'live', 'exist', 'function', 'energise', 'be mode-ified' (*-maya*) or 'natured'. In distinction from Godhead, Death, God lives, for all things are his 'food'. So 'food is the supreme form (*rūpa*) of the Self, food the mode (*-maya*) of the Spirit (*prāna*, here 'breath of life') . . . from food are the begotten (*prajāh*) born (*prajā-yante*) . . . by food they live (*jīvanti*), and thereto they return at last', *Maitrī Uṅ.*, VI.11: and 'it is even He manifested Light': 'motionless dark . . . this darkness is the incomprehensible nature of God . . . first to arise in it is Light . . . (and) this supremely pure splendour of the impartable essence illumines all things at once . . . the patent of his power, resplendent in luminous detail', Eckhart, I.369.373.366.399. Or as our text expresses it, of him, as he shone, were the Waters 'born', that is precisely 'brought to light'; 'He illumines (*bhāsayati*) these worlds . . . incarnadines (*rañjīyati*) existences here', *Maitrī Uṅ.*, VI.7.

'For him who knoweth thus', *ya evam vidvān*, Comprehensor: with this constant refrain the Upanisads invariably introduce a statement of the immediate and the transcendental values of the knowledge previously imparted. Just as Eckhart, for example, after describing the procession of the Spirit as Life, 'it is flowing from the Spirit and is altogether ghostly, and in this power God comes out in the full flower of his joy and glory, as he is in himself', adds 'were he always recollected in this power a man would never age', I.291; or in the words of Böhme, 'The magician has power in this Mystery', *Sex Puncta Mystica*, VI.2. Professor Edgerton has admirably demonstrated how the Vedas are never in search of knowledge for its own sake, but inasmuch as Understanding is thought of as synonymous with plenitude, power, and freedom.²²

The Waters, verily, were a counter-shining (*arka*). What was the foam (*śara*) of the Waters, that solidified, that became Earth (*prithivī*). Thereon He, Self, strove (*asṛāmyat*). The Fiery-Energy (*tejas*) and the Tincture (*rasa*) of his striving (*śrānta*) and intension (*tapta*) broke forth (*niravartat*) as Fire (*agni*). 2.

The 'first day of creation' is thus described as the reflection (*ābhāsa*) of a light-image (*bhā-rūpa*) in the mirror of the as yet undifferentiated possibilities of existence: that is the Sheen of Shining, *arkasya arkatva*, Dante's 'suo splendore . . . risplendendo', *Paradiso*, XXIX.14 and 15.²³ Cf. *Rgveda*, X.82.5 and 6, where the Several Angels are seen together (*samapasyanta*) in One

²²Franklin Edgerton, *The Upanisads: what do they teach, and why?* J.A.O.S., 49, pp. 97-121.

²³In full, 'Not to have gain of any good unto himself, which may not be but that his splendour, counter-shining, might declare, "I am"'. Cf. Plotinus, *Enneads*, V.3.8, 'a splendour directed to itself, which at one and the same time illumines, and is itself illuminated'.

Projection (*arpitam*)²⁴ from the navel of the Unborn (i.e. Varuṇa) as he lies germinal (*garbha*), recumbent (*utīnāpāt*) on the surface of the Waters: and *Pañcaviṃśā Brāhmaṇa*, VII.8.1: 'Unto the Waters came their season. The Spirit stirred their back, therefrom became a fair-thing, Mitra-Varuṇau counter-saw (*paryapasyata*) themselves therein.' 'He shines upon this world in the form of man', *imam lokamahābhārat puruṣarūpeṇa*, *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*, II.2.1. So in Genesis, 'the Spirit of God moved on the face of the Waters', and 'He created man in his own image: 'by this reflection of his divine nature the intellect of the Father fashions or utters itself . . . his light, his flowing intellect to wit, was shining on this world-stuff wherein the world subsisted in the Father in uncreated formless simplicity', Eckhart, I.397 and 404: 'And this is the Image and Likeness of God, and our Image and our Likeness; for in it God reflects Himself and all things', Ruysbroeck, *Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage*, III,²⁵ Dante, 'La gloria di colui che tutto move per l'universo penetra e risplende', and 'quella circolazione, che si concetta pareva in te come lume riflesso . . . mi parve pinta della nostra effigie', *Paradiso*, I.1-2, and XXXIII.127-31.

'For that God is God he gets from creatures', and 'I have loved you in the reflection of my darkness', the 'reflection of the mirror in the sun is in the sun', Eckhart, I.274, 377 and 143: 'as when a man beholdeth his face in a mirror', Böhme, *Clavis*, 42 and 43. Or from Indian sources, 'Without Thee I have no intrinsic-form, without me Thou hast no existence', *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* lii; 'without Śiva no Devī, without Devī no Śiva', *Kāmakalāvīlāsa*, Commentary, citing *āgama* with reference to the text, 2, 'She is the pure mirror wherein Śiva sees his own intrinsic-form.'²⁶ This conception of the relativity of God, Böhme's 'Gegenwurf', which we might call a *prākāśa-vimarsā-vāda*, 'doctrine of light and reflection', and implies that the Fire that shines forth as Light is a *dark* heat until and simultaneously illuminated by the counter-shining, leads to developments of fundamental significance. That God is man-made, 'takes the forms imagined by his worshippers' (*Kailāya-malai*, Ceylon National Review, Jan. 1907, p. 285), that his forms 'are determined by the relation that

²⁴ *Arpitam*, 'infixed', 'projected', geometrically, pictorially, and spatially in the Tree of Life. Cf. Dante's 'trina luce, che in unica stella scintillando'. *Paradiso*, XXXI.28; Eckhart, I.282, 'Everything is pictured in his providence.' The Son is *visūvarūpa*.

²⁵ Corresponding to all this is the Islamic doctrine of 'metaphor of Allāh's creating by looking (*nazar*)', for 'towards everything that Allāh created he has a special aspect (*waḥā* = 'face'), in virtue of which he regards it and preserves it in its appointed place in the order of existence', see Macdonald, D.B., *Development of the Idea of Spirit in Islam*, Acta Orientalia, IX, 1931, p. 347, and Nicholson, R.A., *Studies in Islamic mysticism*, 1921, pp. 110, 114.

²⁶ Cf. also Śaṅkarācārya, *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotya*, I, *darpaṇa-ārāyaṇāna*, 'as if reflected in a mirror'. Or again, form *ḥīti*, *Insānu 'l-kāmil*, Ch. LX. 'As a mirror in which a person sees the form of himself and cannot see it without a mirror, such is the relation of God to the Perfect Man, who cannot possibly see his own form but in the mirror of the name Allāh; and he is also a mirror to God, for God laid upon himself the necessity that His names and attributes should not be seen save in the Perfect Man', Nicholson, *Studies* . . . p. 106. Or yet again, Eckhart, 'It is as if one stood before a high mountain,

subsists the worshipped and the worshipper' (*Śukranīśisāra*, IV. 4, 159), gives man the right to worship him in any guise whereby he is most aware of him and denies man's right to speak of any 'other' gods as 'false'.

The Waters and the Earth are to be understood not only with reference to our terrestrial seas and continents, but as respectively the possibilities of existence in any of the Three Worlds, and the support of living beings existent in any one of them according to the terms of its possibilities: in other words, the 'Waters' are literally *peuṣṭvā*, *bhaviṣya*, the Earth any corresponding plane or sphere (*loka*, *dhātu*, *kṣetra*, *bhūmi*) or support (*pratiṣṭhā*) of experience:²⁷ and any such Earth floats like a lotus, or like foam, or like a ship, on the surface of the Waters in which it is established. The movement of the Spirit by which the Waters are stirred is not in itself a local movement, but local in effect, so that the surface of the Waters is thrown into waves, and thereby the reflection of the Light is multiplied, contracted and identified into variety. *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*, II.1.7, 'As far as the Waters extend as far as Varuṇa extends, so far extends His world', asserts the fundamental doctrine of the identity of 'possible' and 'real'.

The striving and intension are not easy to explain: both imply conation, the latter (*tapas*) is precisely Hebrew *Zimzum*. *Tapas* is not a penance, because not expiatory, but rather an anguish and a passion: a dark heat of the consciousness, a kindling not yet a flame, or to take an analogy from Physics, a raising of potential to the sparking point.²⁸ Notions of a smouldering

and cried, 'Art thou there? The echo comes back. 'Art thou there? If one cries, 'Come out', the echo answers, 'Come out' (Claud Field's *Eckhart's Sermons*, p. 26): as in the *Chāndogya Uṇ*, I.3.2, *samāna u evāyam cāśau* . . . *svara itimam—ācakate svara itī*, *pratyāvaca ityamam*, with double entendre, (1) 'This is called "Sound", That "Sound", viz., an "Echoing"', and (2) 'This is regarded as "Light", That "Light", viz., "reflection"'. It may be observed that the same dual significance is present also in our Upaniṣad, I.2.1, translated above, where *arāṇa acarat* can mean either 'lauded with lauds', or 'manifested light'. The principle involved underlies and explains the offering of lights and music in devotional offices: that is as it were a re-flection of His light and sound upon Himself, whereby His likeness (*mūrti*, *prātmā*, or other *prākāśa*) is revealed to the officiant, which likewise otherwise remains unseen and unobscured, alone in its dark shrine.

The metaphor of reflection implies, of course, a correspondence of microcosm and macrocosm, cf. 'Yonder world is the counterpart (*anurūpam*) of this world, and of yonder world this world is the counterpart', *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VIII.2.

²⁷ Cf. Böhme, 'even thy own earth also (that is, thy body)', *Supersensual Life*: Sāyana, on *Rgveda*, VI.16.13, *bhūmīśca sarvajagata ādhāra-bhūten*, 'Earth is the support of every world'; and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṇ*, II.5.1, 'This Earth is honey for all creatures', i.e. the support of their existence, each after its kind.

In *Rgveda*, I.108.9, and X.59.4, respectively, the Three Worlds, and Heaven and Earth, are spoken of as 'Earths'.

²⁸ The root *tap* can also be employed transitively, as in *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*, II. 4, where *ātmā* . . . *puruṣam* . . . *abhyatapat*, where *abhyatapat* has been rendered by Max Müller and others as 'brooded upon', no doubt with reference to the idea of a brooding hen.

continence and intellectual fermentation, as well as of a vegetative incubation, are implied. *Tejas* and *rasa* are forms of energy, respectively fiery and fluid: *tejas* the fire of love and wrath, *rasa* the elixir, tincture, or water of life. *Tejas* as element corresponds in part to 'phlogiston'.

'Broke forth as fire': for 'the Eternal Father is manifested in the fire . . . this *flagrati* is effected in the enkindling of the fire in the essence of the anguish', Böhme, *Signatura Rerum*, XIV.38 and 31, 'with the enkindling of the fire in the salubral flagrat two kingdoms separate, viz., eternity and time', *ibid.*, VII.8, cf. 'the fire itself, viz., the first principle in the life, with which the light and dark world do separate', *ibid.*, IV.8. Also 'A third master has said that God is a fire. He too speaks truly, though in a likeness. For Fire is the noblest in nature and mightiest in operation amongst the elements it never rests until it reaches heaven. It is much wider and higher than Air, Water, or Earth, it comprehends all other elements in itself', Eckhart, from Büttner's *Schriften and Predigten*, 1923, II, p. 144.

Agni, 'Fire', appears in the Vedic liturgies as the preferred designation of the First-manifested Principle, on the one hand because of the fiery nature of the Supernal-Sun, and on the other because of the primary importance of fire in the sacrificial ritual. In our text (2 and 3) the divine Fire is alluded to from two different points of view, first as an undivided principle, as also specifically in *Rgveda*, I.69.1, where Agni is the 'Father of the Angels' and V.3.1, where Agni is Varuṇa 'at birth', and Mitra 'when enkindled', 'in Him' are the Several Angels, and He is Indra to the mortal worshipper: and second, as one member of the Trinity of Agni, Ādiṭya, Vāyu. The latter Agni, the Son of God, is commonly called Vaiśvānara, 'Universal', with reference to his manifestation in the terrestrial, intermediate, and celestial regions; and is pre-eminently 'First-born' and 'Youngest' because perpetually brought to birth in the sacrificial fire at the dawn of every temporal cycle and the dawn of every day.

In any case, it is an elemental Fiery Energy (*tejas*) that underlies and typifies all other manifestation: so in procession, 'the Fiery-energy (*tejas*), intrinsic form of the firmament, in the vacance of the inner man, determined as the Trinity of Fire, Supernal-Sun, and Spirit, three factors of the Imperishable Word, OM, sprouts forth, springs up, and suspires (or blossoms)' as a Burning Bush, the all-pervading Tree of Life, *Mantrī Up.*, see pp. 60-1. With this compare Isaiah, XI.1.2, *Egredietur virga de radice Jesse et flos de radice ejus ascendet et requiescet super cum spiritus domini*, and Eckhart's Commentary, 'Root of Jesse is a term for the fiery nature of God. . . . Jesse means a fire and a burning; it signifies the ground of divine love and also, the ground of the soul. Out of this ground the rod grows, i.e. in the purest and highest; it shoots up out of this virgin soil at the breaking forth of the Son. Upon the rod opens

Something like the transformation of energy into heat by an interposition of resistance is involved. With *tejas* may be compared not only Hebrew *zimmum*, but also German *sudeas* used by Böhme, and explained by Law as 'a boiling or seething . . . the stirring of the seven properties in nature'.

a flower, the flower of the Holy Ghost', I.153.154.302.²⁹ Likewise Böhme, 'The entire man is in his being the three worlds. The soul's centre, viz., the root of the soul's fire contains the dark-world; and the soul's fire contains the first Principle as the true fire-world. And the noble image, or the tree of divine growth, which is generated from the soul's fire and buds forth through fierce wrathful death in freedom or in the world of light, contains the light-world or the second Principle. And the body, which in the beginning was created out of the mixed substance which at creation arose from the light-world, the dark-world, and the fire-world contains the outer world or the third mixed Principle', *Sex Puncta Mystica*, V.28: here the first, second, and third Principles correspond to the Trinity of Fire, Supernal-Sun, and Spirit, and the properties, *tamas*, *sattva*, and *rajās*.

Rasa is the sappy vegetative life in trees and plants, a tincture in rain, the elixir of life, the *soma*-dew that drips from the world-tree, seed in all that reproduce their kind, savour in all things eaten or drunk, and the principle of beauty in art. *Rasa* is the fertilizing (*raitasa*) energy, the 'flowing' intellect, as for example in *Rgveda*, I.164.8, where Mother-Earth, partaking of Father-Heaven, is 'pervaded by the tincture' (*rasā nivāddhā*), and the Calf (= Agni) is begotten. 'I understand here the virtual salt in the vegetable life', Böhme, *Signatura Rerum*, IX.22. Cf. the Stoic *Logos spermatikos*.

He effected in himself a Trinity (*tridhā*): one-third Fire (*agni*), one-third Supernal-Sun (*āditya*), one-third Wind (*vāyu*).

He is verily, the Spirit (*prāṇa*), determined (*vihita*) in a Trinity: of the *Three Worlds*, in the likeness of a horse. His head the eastern (*prācī*) airt, his fore-legs that and that airt on either side. Likewise his tail the western (*prācī*) airt, his hinder-legs that and that airt on either side. His flanks the south and north. His back the heavens (*dyau*), his belly firmament (*antarikṣa*), his underneath this ground. He is established (*pratiṣṭhā*) in the Waters. He who knoweth this is established wherever he may be. 3.

'A Trinity', that is as the principle of Fire in any Earth, of Light in any Heaven, of Motion in any Firmament. This basic angelic Trinity of three Principles or Persons is constantly lauded, continually referred to in the Vedas and Upaniṣads.³⁰ 'One of them (i.e. Agni) scythes when the year-of-time is

²⁹In Christian art the Tree of Jesse corresponds to the Vedic descriptions of the Tree of Life (*Rgveda*, I.24.7, *Atharvaveda*, X.7.38, *Kaṭha Up.*, and *Mantrī Up.*, as cited here), and to the later representations of the Birth of Brahmā. See my *Tree of Jesse*, Art Bulletin, XI.2, 1929, and *Yajñas*, II, 1931, also Strzygowski, *Asiatische Miniaturmalerei*, 1932, p. 167.

³⁰Not infrequently, e.g., in *Bṛhad Devatā*, I.69, 'Indra and Vāyu' are counted as one Person in this Trinity. On Indra, see pp. 96f.

It must, of course, be understood that Vedic 'theology' takes account of two different kinds of Trinity, (1) ontological, analogous to the Christian concept, and

done; one of them (i.e. Āditya) with his powers surveys the worlds; of one of them (i.e. Vāyu) his sweep is seen, but not his likeness', *Rgveda*, I.164.44. *Maitrī Uṅ.*, IV.5-6, may be cited: 'Fire (agni), Wind (vāyu) and Supernal-Sun (āditya)—Food (anna), Spirit (prāna), Time (kāla)—Rudra, Brahmā, Viṣṇu . . . these are the primary embodiments (tanu) of the transcendental (para) incorporeal (asātrā) . . . Brahman.' Cf. 'Now then fire is the first cause of life; and light is the second cause; and the spirit is the third cause, and yet there is but one essence . . . which manifesteth itself', Böhme, *XL Questions concerning the Souls*, I.276.

Now with respect to the three Persons of this Trinity: Āditya is the Supernal-Sun,³¹ the 'Golden Person' in the Sun, immediate source of image-bearing light (sarūpa jyoti), consubstantial with the real and imageless (amūrta, nirābhāsa) Brahman, who is very Light (jyoti), for 'that Light is the same as the Supernal-Sun', *Maitrī Uṅ.*, VI.3; the personal name is Viṣṇu, sattva-natured, for he keeps things in being. Vāyu, Wind, is the Self hypostasized as the Breath of Life, consubstantial with Brahman, Spiritus, *prāna*, whose breath is in himself, unsuspired (*avāta*, *Rgveda*, X.129.2), despirated (Buddhist *nirvāta*);³² here the personal name is Brahmā (Prajāpati,³³ etc.) who is *rajas*-natured, being the progenitive Person, who gives to every existence its extension in space. Agni is here specifically the fiery nature, sometimes called the Wrath of God, the devourer and transformer of all existences: whose personal name is Rudra, Śiva, *tamas*-natured, for all change

(2) that of the Trimūrti of Persons distinguished functionally. Both are 'arrangements' of One Power, but made from different points of view. The Universe is three-fold from many distinct points of view.

³¹It will be realized, of course, that Āditya, the Supernal-Sun, Child of Aditi, Petrarach's *il sommo sol*, Dante's *somma luce*, is not merely our sidereal sun, but shines as the first principle of Light and Time throughout the 'hundred years' of the lifetime of Brahmā-Prajāpati, the one 'year' of our Upaniṣad. The Supernal-Sun is the 'Father of Lights' in the Three Worlds. 'As the Deity, viz., the divine light, is the centre of all life, so also in the manifestation of God, viz., in the figure (i.e. *prāṅka*), the sun is the centre of all life', Böhme, *Signatura Rerum*, IV.18, cf. *Maitrī Uṅ.*, VI.30. As Swedenborg expresses it, 'it is evident that in the spiritual world there is a different sun from that of the natural world'.

³²Our rendering of *nirvāna*, *nirvāta*, as 'despiration', etc., is based on etymological grounds, cf., *avāta*, 'without spiration' and on the fundamental connotation. But it should not be overlooked that in later and especially Buddhist usage it is an extinction rather of the flame than of the breath of life that is immediately denoted. The distinction rather logical than real; *nāma* and *prāna* being inseparable 'movements', simultaneous alike in origination and cessation. 'Deflagration' might have been a better rendering of (Buddhist) *nirvāna*, but the use in Physics of deflagration as practically equivalent to conflagration makes this difficult. The to be preferred renderings of Buddhist *nirvāna* and *parinirvāna* seem to be 'Extinction' and 'Total Extinction', with reference, that is, to the flame of life.

³³Prajāpati occurs in the *Rgveda*, viz., IV.53.2, as an epithet of Savitr as Universal Mover, and X.121.10 again as an epithet of the Supernal-Sun.

is a dying, a going forth of individual form into the dark night of non-existence. At the same time this Trinity is One Being, to whom as such either of these personal names can be directly applied; the functions are described, rather than divided in the Persons. 'Albeit separately lauded, these three Lords of the World are of one Self-hood and a common Nature' (*Bṛhad Devātā*, I.70-4): that unity of the Several angels is Agni (*Rgveda*, V.3.1); or any one member of the Trinity may stand for all, as when in *Rgveda*, I.115.1, the Supernal-Sun (Sūrya) is called the Self of the Universe, or Vāyu similarly in X.168.4.³⁴

Prāna, Spiritus, Pneuma, Life (Taoist *ch'i*; Islamic *rūḥ*) is an essential name of the Self, as Father or as Son: not as in Christian theology, a distinct Person, though in every other respect equivalent to the 'Holy Ghost'. In procession, by way of the Will as the principle of Motion, *prāna* is often spoken of as *vāta* or *vāyu*, Wind or Air: and as the breaths of life in all existences, the Spirit becomes manifold, particularly fivefold (*Āitarāja Aranyaka*, II.3.3, *Taittirīya Uṅ.*, I.7, *Śvetāvatara Uṅ.*, I.5, etc.).

Prāna, Vāyu, Vāta, is that Gale of the Spirit which begins to blow at the dawn of every cycle of manifestation: thereby the glassy surface of the Waters is thrown into waves, each one of which reflects the Supernal-Sun, creating a multifarious Sheen or counter-shining, which is the world-picture. That dawn wind is not specifically mentioned in our text, but implied in the mention of the Spirit, and when it is said that the Earth becomes from the foam of the Waters.³⁵ Hence arises one of the fundamental problems of theology, 'Why does the dawn wind of creation blow, and why as it blows?' We say *akāmyai*, 'by the Will of God', but that is more of a description than an answer. For his Will is not an arbitrary will, an accident of being, as though He needed anything, but inevitable and essential: as Eckhart expresses it, 'think not that it is with God as with a human carpenter, who works or works not as he chooses, who can do or leave undone at his good pleasure. It is not thus with God. . . . He must do, willy-nilly', I.23 and 263, cf. *Saddharma Puṇḍarīka*, XV (prose), 'the Tathāgata does what-must-be-done', *kartavyam karoti*. God's idiosyncrasy are both eternal work and eternal rest. He cannot do otherwise than he does: for his omnipotence does not extend to a capacity for being any other or any less than he is, he cannot make that which has been not to have been, for all that has been is in and of himself, and all the future is.³⁶

³⁴*Rgveda*, X. 168. 4, *ātmā devānām, bhuvanasya garbhā*.

Cf. *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa*, II.77, 'Who is the one and only Angel? Spirit (*prāna*)', and *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, III.1.1, 'There is but one entire, Angel (viz., Vāyu), the others are but semi-Angels'.

³⁵For Vāyu as the dawn-wind of creation see especially *Rgveda*, I.134, where it is clear that the wind is thought of as precedent to dawn, being indeed called upon to awaken the dawn. It may be added that 'Dawn' (Uṣas, etc.) in the Vedic hymns generally refers to dawn of a cycle of manifestation, not merely any dawn (human dawns are but in the analogy of cosmic dawns, just as human years are but analogies of supernal 'years').

³⁶As expressed by Śāṅkarācārya, 'His nature is inscrutable', *na ca svabhāvaḥ paryanyuktum śakyate*, Comment on *Brahma Sūtra*, I.2.93.

It is not too hard to understand that 'God's will to the creature was only one, viz., a general manifestation of the spirit', Böhme, *Signatura Rerum*, XVI.25, Swinburne's 'Thou biddst me but be.' But the gift of life, 'in its explication and manifestation it goes forth from eternity to eternity into two essences, viz., into evil and to good', Böhme, *ibid.*, 20; no manifestation (*vyāñjana*) is conceivable except in terms of pairs of opposites, *dvandvau*. But how is the distribution of good and evil in the world determined? That is a knotty problem, for we cannot imagine the eternal energy as having predilection or as playing favourites amongst the figures of its puppet show; nor on the other hand that anything existent has come to be just what it is by mere chance, 'existence' and 'causality' being connascent concepts of the intellect.

Perhaps to our surprise we shall find that the problem has been treated similarly by Hindu and Christian theologians. Indian tradition, in all its forms, maintains that the individual alone is responsible for all the good or evil that befalls him; he gets, as we say colloquially, just what is coming to him, he 'asks for it'. As expressed in the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, II.3.2, *yathāprajñam hi sambhavañ*, 'they are born according to the measure of their understanding', cf. *Kaṣīlakī Uṇ.*, I.2, *yathāvidyam*. Time, intrinsic nature, necessity, accident, the elements, and ancestry (*yonī, puruṣa*) may be posited (as causes of natural species); but inasmuch as the nature of Self is not a combination of these, the Self is not the Ruler (*īśa*) of the cause of pleasure and pain . . . that Self which takes on every form is not also the shaper of forms', *Śvetāsvatara Uṇ.*, I.2 and 9. So the *Chāndogya Uṇ.*, VIII. 1.4, points out that begotten existences (*prajāḥ*) get their deserts *anusāsana* (lit. 'according to what is decreed', *sāsana* having here the force of 'natural law', the 'law of heaven', *dharma, rta*): inasmuch as the individual existences live-dependent-on (*upajvantī*) their such and such desired ends (*yam yamantam-abhikāmaḥ*). Similarly in our Upaniṣad, IV.4.5-7 and 22, summarized, 'according to a man's works, which are actuated by his will, good or evil, as the case may be, and though he may attain his ends, he must return again from the other world to this world: he only who is without desire, whose desire is fulfilled, whose desire is him-Self, reaches Brahman, there neither right nor wrong that he may have done affect him': he escapes there from merit and demerit, *puṇyapāpa, dharmādharmau*.

Similarly Śaṅkarācārya, *Vedānta Sūtra*, II.1.32-5, Commentary, maintains that injustice cannot be charged to Brahman, for as much as he does not act independently, but with regard to (*sāpekṣa*) merit and demerit (*dharmādharmau*): he being the common cause of the becoming of all things, but not of the distinctions between them, which distinctions are determined by the 'varying works inherent in the respective personalities'.³⁷

³⁷Blake's 'Man is born like a garden, ready planted and sown': Jung, 'The psychological individual . . . has an *a priori* unconscious existence', *Psychological types*, p. 560.

Böhmé's conception of the one harmony and its necessarily diverse manifestations has its equivalent in the theology of Jñi, where every divine 'attribute has its effect (*āthār*) in which its *jamāl* or *jalāl* or *kamāl* is manifested' so that 'Paradise is the mirror of a absolute *jamāl*, Hell of absolute *jalāl*', Nicholson, *Studies* . . . p. 100.

Quite or nearly in accord with this, St. Thomas, distinguishing Fate from Providence, says that it is 'manifest that fate is in the created causes themselves', *Sum. Theol.*, I, Q. 116, A. 2. Böhmé is even more definite: 'as is the harmony, viz., the life's form in each thing, so is also the sound or tone of the eternal voice therein; in the holy, holy, in the perverse perverse', and that is determined by the *turba* 'which Adam took in by his imagination' and which comes into the world with every individual form of the spirit, 'hanging to it', 'therefore no creature can blame its creator, as if he made it evil', *Signatura Rerum*, XVI. 6 and 7, and XI. *Questions concerning the Soule*, VIII.14. Compare also Dante *Paradiso*, XVII.37-42, 'Contingency, that does not extend beyond the page of your material, is all depicted in the eternal aspect; though it takes not its necessity therefrom, no more than does a ship as it floats down the stream (depend upon) that image wherein she is mirrored.'

All that follows naturally from the conclusion that neither good nor evil can have, as such, any place in pure being; that point of view, is so constantly maintained in the Upaniṣads, *Bhagavad Gītā*, and in Buddhism, that the citation of a couple of passages will amply suffice. He, Brahman, is 'other than right and wrong' (*dharmādharmau*), and 'when a mortal has rent away what is rightful (*dharmya*) and receives Him as undimensioned (*anu*), then he rejoices', *Kaṭha Uṇ.*, II.13 and 14: 'The Lord of the world emanates neither agency nor actions, nor the conjunction of action and reward, but it is each thing's nature that operates.'³⁸ The Lord accepts neither the ill nor the well-done of any man', *Bhagavad Gītā*, V.14-15. In Christianity, besides that 'He makes his sun to shine alike upon the just and the unjust', we find uncompromising words in Eckhart: 'I must let go virtue if I would see God

³⁸The primordial causality of intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*) is categorically denied in *Śvetāsvatara Uṇ.*, I.2, and VI.1. The contradiction involved is more apparent than real, and depends on the distinction of 'cause' from 'means'. It is indeed 'by the Almighty of the Angel (i.e. the 'Father') that this Brahma-wheel revolves': but the position of each existent (*śūta* = *avyāpaka*) thing, its specific modality, is determined by qualities inherent in the thing itself.

This intrinsic nature, whereby each thing is what it is, constitutes the private measure of free will of each thing, though its autonomy is limited by the coexistence of other things.

The question, whether God as he is in himself knows good and evil as we know them can be answered with assurance in the negative by the consideration that He cannot be thought of as subjected to limitations of individuality; the knowledge of good and evil belongs to *aviśyā*, 'ignorance', 'relativity'. In the same way with respect to causal operation, a temporal separation of cause and effect being inconceivable from the standpoint of absolute understanding (*viśyā*). Cf. *Rigveda*, I.164.32, 'He who hath made him (Agni Vaiśvānara) knows him not.'

It may be noted that *Genesis*, III.22, now translated 'The Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us to know good and evil', should have been rendered 'Behold the man who hath been like one of us, is come to know good through evil', cf. Ogden and Richards, *The Meaning of meaning*, 3rd edn., 1930, p. 224, Note 1, and cf. also our Note 115 *infra*.

face to face', 'God is neither good nor true', 'the vision of God transcends virtues', 'joys and sorrows are not sown in the ground of eternal truth', there, there is 'no trace of vice or virtue'; 'there is nothing free but the first cause', I.144.272.273.467.374.146. Were it otherwise, He could not be spoken of as 'just'. So the dawn wind of creation must be thought of as of a double origin: one of the Spirit, moving without motion or any why, the other actuated by and because of past events.

It is not proposed to discuss here in any detail the doctrine of reincarnation, *punarapādāna*, *punarāvṛtī*. We shall take it for granted that in its original and pure form³⁹ this doctrine simply implied a return from angelic to corporeal existence, in accordance with a natural-law (*tiāstā*, *ṛtaya*, *dharma*)⁴⁰ affecting all those who have not by gnosis (*jñāna*, *vidyā*) already achieved a total emancipation (*atī-muktā*), nor embarked on the angelic voyage (*devayāna*) of progressive emancipation (*krama muktī*), and so have neither escaped, nor are in the way to escape from the bondage of desirous works (*kāmya karma*) which are the determinants of merit and demerit (*dharmaadharmau*, *puṇya-pāpa*). We take it for granted also, what is perhaps less certain, that the return (*punarāvartana*, *avasarpāna*, or *yuga*, or *kalpa*, or even in another *para* with the resurrection of the cosmic horse, the birth of another Brahmā-Prajāpati.⁴¹

It is with this last return and resurrection that we are primarily concerned. Granting the aforesaid premises, it is abundantly apparent that Brahmā-Prajāpati, Puruṣa, Son, First Sacrificer, Cosmic Horse and Tree of Life, insofar

³⁹In case the doctrine of reincarnation was originally of popular origin, this would mean 'first intellectual formulation': whenever that may have been. Liberation and rebirth are already distinguished and contrasted in *Rgveda*, V.46.1, in the phrase *vimucam na avṛtam puṇaḥ* 'neither liberation nor coming back again'.

⁴⁰This Law, of which the ordinances (*dharma*) are established by the first sacrifice, *Rgveda*, X.90.16, might be stated as follows: Within the realm of causality, causality operates uniformly, through time and time again. Moreover, as the creation (sacrifice) is without beginning or end, so also is the Law without beginning or end.

⁴¹Eckhart, I.379, 'Aught is suspended from the divine essence; its progression is matter, wherein the soul puts on new forms and puts off her old ones. The change from one into the other is her death: the one she doffs she dies to, and the one she dons she lives in', presents a remarkable likeness to *Bhagavad Gītā*, II.22, 'As a man casting off worn-out garments, taketh other new ones, so the embodied being, casting off worn out bodies, enters into other new ones.' I do not infer that Eckhart is speaking of reincarnation, in the accepted sense of the word, but rather that he is referring to a progress in wisdom of the individual Self, as in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṣ.*, IV.4.4, 'just so this self, striking down this body and driving out its ignorance, makes for itself another newer and fairer form, such as that of the Patriarchs, Choristers, Angels, Prajāpati, Brahmā, or other living beings'. Both this passage, and that cited from the *Gītā* could be, and perhaps should be understood to mean not a reincarnation of the individual, but the continuous reincarnation of the Spirit, in forms causally determined by past acts, and so inherited by other, not the same, individuals. Just as we invoke such names as gene or germ-plasm to account for character and species.

as they exist in and of the Three Worlds, could in no way have been thought of as exempt from the universal law of latent causality, *pūruṣa* or *adṛṣṭa karma*. For the works of Prajāpati, his twin sacrifices (*yajña*), are pre-eminently *kāmya*, desirous: 'Prajāpati desiring offspring (*prajākāmya*) sacrificed', *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, II.4.4.4. Further in fact behaves like a Patriarch (*pitṛ*), and as such no other way or voyage can be imagined for him but that of the Patriarchs, the *pitṛyāna*. For deity takes on mortality with all its consequences: hence in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṣ.*, II.3.1, the Brahman in a likeness (*mūrta*) is rightly called mortal, *martya*, his 'hundred years' are all of time, but not the timeless.⁴² That conception of his mortality is echoed too by Eckhart, 'God comes and Goes . . . God passes away', 'before creatures were, God was not God', 'all the Persons being clapt into their nature vanish into the dim silence of their interior being', I.143.218.469; 'they become one', *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, II.3.8, 'where all existence becometh of one nest', *Mahānārāyaṇa Uṣ.*, II.3.

Insofar⁴³ then, as Deity is in the world, he is bound by Works, his Will or Providence, being however righteous (*dharma*) comparable to the 'ordinary will' based on predilection, is not free: thought of as Rtaspati or Dharmarāja, still he is not above the law, not un-just.⁴⁴ Free-will, in our sense of the words, represents a contradiction in terms: as the Upaniṣad, cited above, expresses it, and as the Buddhist also felt so strongly, existences are dependent on (*upajīvanti*), the slaves of, their desires, and that holds equally for good and bad desires, for man and for incarnate God. Man's free will consists only in a freedom not to will, a freedom to return to the centre of his being, to identify

⁴²So there is a *śatva-parimara* = Götterdämmerung, *Kausītaki Uṣ.*, I.12.

⁴³That 'insofar' is doctrinally an important point. For pantheism and 'natural religion' are excluded equally by the Vedas and in Christianity. Primarily, in that infinity is incommensurable with the totality of things finite. Also explicitly, 'Only one-fourth of him is born here', *Rgveda*, X.90.4: 'Heaven and Earth have not measured, nor do they measure, his omnipotence' *ibid.*, III.82.37; 'Thou dost insist beyond all things, the several worlds', *ibid.*, I.81.5 and I.102.8; 'of the bright power that pervades the sky it is but a part', *Maitrī Uṣ.*, VI.35; 'not I in them, but they in Me'; *na tvaham tesu te mayi*, *Bhagavad Gītā*, VII.12. 'I am existent only in a fraction', *aham . . . akāśmīna śhīlakā*, *ibid.*, X.42. 'God enjoys himself in all things . . . yet he loses nothing of his brightness', Eckhart, I.143; 'of that also is the creation, but not in the omnipotence and power, but like an apple which grows upon the tree, which is not the tree itself, but grows from the power of the tree', Böhm, *Signatura Rerum*, XVI.1; 'See now the height and breadth of the eternal Worth, which hath made for itself so many mirrors wherein it is refracted, and yet remains within itself One, as before', Dante, *Paradiso*, XXIX.142-5.

In general, the notion of 'pantheism', read into any doctrine, arises from a confusion of the unity which is one in itself, with the merely collective totality of all things.

⁴⁴All evils and afflictions as well as all kinds of happiness of man . . . are distributed according to justice', Maimonides, *Guide for the Perplexed*, III.17. To be merciful is to be unjust: 'have the seasons, gravitation, the appointed days, mercy? no more have I', Whitman, *Chanting the Square Desjfic*.

his own will with His Will who 'works willingly but not by will, naturally but not by nature', Eckhart, I.225. The ordinary will extends only to particular goods; but 'the potentiality of the will extends to the universal good . . . just as the object of the intellect extends to universal being', St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, I, Q. 105, A. 4; hence, as Rūmi expresses it, 'Whoso hath not surrendered will, no will hath he.' Free-will is not in the order of nature: he is autonomous (*svarāj*) who knows the Self (*ātman*), but 'those whose knowledge is other-wise than this are heteronomous (*anyarājāt*)', theirs are perishing worlds, in none of all the worlds are they movers-at-will (*kāmacārāḥ*), *Chāndogya Uṇ.*, VII.25.2).

If we have seemed to compromise the liberty (*adītiya*), lordship (*aīsvarya*) or great-Self-hood (*mahātmaya*) of the Person as he is in the world, all the more majestic, more desirable, becomes that Will that is indeed free, his will 'whose Will is him-Self', as he is 'alone with him-Self', *ek jō āpāi āp*, Kabir: 'self-intent', and 'loving only himself', Eckhart.⁴⁶ For with the Eye that goes with that Will, he as overseer of *karma*, and we denuded of our virtues, indistinct from and unanimous with Him, are *in posse* to survey the world-picture and to take an infinite delight therein⁴⁶: that picture being his and our eternal play and dalliance, his *līlā*, inhering in him-Self, our-Self.—'There has always been this play going on in the Father-nature . . . played eternally before all creatures. . . sport and players are the same', Eckhart, I.148—'not that this joy first began with the creation, no, for it was from eternity in the great mystery, yet only as a spiritual melody and sport in itself. The creation is the same sport out of himself, viz., a platform or instrument of the Eternal Spirit', Böhme, *Signaturae Rerum*, XVI.2.3.⁴⁷

Two Trinities (*tridhā*) are mentioned: it is to be understood that both are manifested (*vyaakta*) and intelligible (*jīyāya*) but the first (Fire, Supernal-Sun, and Spirit) is informal (*arūpa*), the second (the Three Worlds, Earth, Heaven, Firmament) aspectual (*rūpa*) and perceptible (*dīśya*). Here the Trinity is called an 'arrangement', *dhā*. In the *Taittirīya Uṇ.*, I.3.1-4, where five aspects of the fundamental Trinity are explained, the term *samhitā*, 'grouping' is employed. Eckhart speaks similarly of the Trinity as an 'arrangement' and as 'articulate speech', the Persons being 'illuminations of the understanding'.⁴⁸

⁴⁶That Self-intention is his knowledge of him-Self, as it were a *maithuna*, carnal knowledge, of Wisdom, *vāc*: the 'cause' of the becoming of the world, for what is 'concept' therein is a thing begotten and proceeding, after the way of things 'conceived'.

⁴⁶Śaṅkarācārya, *Svātmantarūpaṇa*, 95. The concept of a world-picture is implicit in *Rgveda*, I.164.44, *vāsvam abhicaste*.

⁴⁷Cf. also Jīli, as cited by Nicholson, *Studies* . . . p. 113: 'Allāh created Adam in his own image . . . and Adam was one of the theatres in which I displayed myself', and *ibid.*, 108, 'I am that whole, and the whole is my theatre'. On Indian *līlā* see Śaṅkarācārya on *Vedānta Sūtra*, II. 1. 33.

⁴⁸The 'articulate' (a+u+m) of the Imperishable-Word, OM, should be observed. See Note 115: cf. also Bhāgavan Das, *The science of peace*, 1904.

In our text the body of the aspectual Trinity is conceived in the likeness of a horse. 'Meseems that thou art Varuṇa, O steed . . . speeding with wings on paths fair and dustless', *Rgveda*, I.163.4 and 5, and *Taittirīya Samhitā*, IV.6.7. For Varuṇa was the ancient name of the Supreme Being, Āditya, Supernal-Sun, Child-of-the-Liberty. The cosmic horse is more fully described in the first *adhyaīya* of our Upaniṣad, corresponding to *Atharvaveda*, X.7.32-4. The Sun is his eye, the Wind the breath of his nostrils, Universal Fire his open mouth, the Year his body, stars his bones, clouds his flesh, and he bears angels, choirs, titans and men alike across the nether (*aparā*)⁴⁹ sea of the possibilities of existence, for the 'sea is his kin (*bandhu*), his womb (*yonī*)'. In a similar likeness Eckhart speaks of God's delights: 'The joy and satisfaction of it are ineffable. It is like a horse turned loose in a lush meadow giving vent to his horse-nature by galloping full-tilt about the field: he enjoys it, and it is his nature. And just in the same way God's joy and satisfaction in his likes finds vent in his pouring out his entire nature and his being into this likeness, for he is this likeness himself', I.240: compare *Rgveda*, VII.87.2, referring to

⁴⁹*Aparā* is often understood to mean 'western', but is here assuredly used in its primary sense, that is just as when we speak of *para* and *aparā* Brahman. For the upper and the nether Waters in Indian tradition see. e.g., *Rgveda*, III.22.3, and *Taittirīya Samhitā*, IV.2.4, where the Waters of the Sun are spoken of as *parastāt*, and those below are *avasīāt* (= *aparastāt* or *aparā*): and *Rgveda*, X.136.5, where the two seas are *pūrva* and *aparā*, commonly understood to mean eastern and western. Not forgetting that these are cosmic seas, of which the Bay of Bengal and the Arabian sea are merely symbols, it is quite intelligible that upper and nether should have been taken alternatively to mean eastern and western: for just as the sidereal sun rises in an actual East and sets in an actual West, so must the Supernal-Sun rise in analogically 'eastern' and set in analogically 'western' waters.

Both seas were originally Varuṇa's (cf. p. 59). Why then is Varuṇa later particularly connected with the West, the night, the Moon, and not always with the East and West, the Sun and Moon, the day and night? Because the dual Mitrā-Varuṇau had been originally the personal name of manifested deity conceived under two aspects, viz., as Varuṇa 'at birth' (*jāyase*) and as Mitra 'when enkindled' (*samidhāh*), *Rgveda*, V.3.1, and III.5.4: 'at birth', that would be as the Fiery-Energy (*tejas, mahi*) of intention (*tapas*), cf. *Rgveda*, X.129.2, *tapasah mahinā ajāyata* 'when enkindled', that would be in procession as Light (*prakāśa*) manifested by the dark-heat (*urna*), *Maitrī Uṇ.*, VII. 11, *samirane prakāśa-prakṣe paṇṣṭyasthāniya*. In the dual Mitrā-Varuṇau, Mitra, 'the Friend', designates the terrestrial Agni, so often spoken of in the same way as the 'Friend' of man, this terrestrial Agni being the Son or manifested form of Varuṇa himself; as in the one-hymn devoted solely to Mitra, he is the Mouthpiece (*bruvānāh*), the all-seeing Eye in the world (*animitiā abhicaste*, cf. the Buddha as *cakkhūni loke, Digha Nikāya*, II.158), the common denominator of all men in that he 'unites' (*yājayati*) them and who upholds (*lādāhāra, astambhāyati*) heaven and earth. That Mitra is commonly thought of as a celestial aspect, viz., solar, as also in the Avesta, though described as terrestrial in *Rgveda*, III.59, presents no difficulty; for Agni's dual birth (*dhyanma*) is in heaven and on earth (*dhāvā-pṛthivyā*), both on high and here below, the two fires are 'one Angel' as in our text (see p. 63); just as in Christian phraseology, 'I and my Father are One', Son being also Sun (see p. 68 and cf. Note 10).

Varuṇa, 'The Gale that is thy-Self thunders through the firmament like an untamed stag that takes his pleasure in the fields.'

This is a likeness (*mūrti*) and a figure (*prastāka*) connatural with that of the Tree of Life or that of the World-wheel: a figure or image of the Divine Being in extension, space pervading, not forgetting that the locus of this space (*ākāśa*) is in the lotus of the heart. With the becoming of the cosmic horse-body, that of the Three Worlds is established (*prastāhā*) in the Waters. The remainder of the *adhyāya* explains the further becoming of the world in terms of generation and utterance, and with respect to mortality, sacrifice, and regeneration. The horse sacrifice is an imitation⁵⁰ of the divine passion and of regeneration: and he who understands, the comprehensor of this drama, *ya evam vidvān*, has verily performed the sacrifice, and thereby shares in a more abundant life, both here and now in the flesh, and there-beyond in eternity.

He, Death, Privation, willed (*akāmayat*) 'Let there be born (*jāyēt*) of Me a second Self' (*dvitīya... ātman*). By means of the Intellect (*manas*) there came about a carnal-knowledge (*mīthuna*) of the *unspoken*⁵¹ Word (*vāc*). What was the seed (*retas*), that became the Year (*sarivatsara*). Ere that there was no Year. He let bear him for as long as is the Year, after that poured him forth (*asṛjata*).

When he was born (*jāta*), Death (*mṛtyu*) yawned upon him. He gave out a cry (*bhān*): that became the *spoken*⁵² Word (*vāc*). 4.

That is, Godhead already Selfed as Intellect, would go out further into existence. For by and in himself, the Father is an Intellect devoid of intellection, an Energy that does not energise: his paternity is only actualized by the filiation of a Son. The Year, Prajāpati, the Horse, is the begotten Son of God. That is God's understanding of himself, I am that I am, the paternal Intellect's conception of the maternal Word; 'comprehension belongs to his paternal power', Eckhart, I.364. 'The begotten (*prajā*) is the combination (*sandhi*) of these conjoint principles, begetting (*praśanana* = *maithuna*) the means (*sandhāna*), *Taittirya Uṇ*, I.3.3.

That the Year,⁵³ Brahmā-Prajāpati, the Yakṣa in the Tree of Life, the Cosmic Horse, mortal by nature and immortal in their essence are one and the same as God's only-begotten Son incarnate, who died as Jesus but is from

⁵⁰In this sense the whole ritual may be regarded as 'Mysterium und Mimus', and the question whether or not any particular Vedic hymn should be regarded as 'dramatic' loses its significance.

⁵¹This eternal Brahman is at once the Imperishable-Word (*akāśara*) and the Word-that-can-be-spoken (*vācya*); *Bṛhad-Devatā*, I.62. Utterance (*vyākṛti*) is further discussed below, Note 64. *Ītān* = Fiat Lux.

⁵²I.e. what could be called in Greek the 'Eniautos-Daimon'.

⁵³For Buddhism, and the doctrine of the identity of all teaching, see particularly the *Saṅgharāma Puṅḍarīka*. In all but name the Tathāgata is identified with Brahmā-Prajāpati.

Eternity Christ and Logos in the bosom of the Father is *a priori* apparent from many points of view, for example in the procession by generation, and in the acts of voluntary sacrifice, 'himself unto himself'. 'Who sees Me, sees the Father' may be compared to *Maitri Uṇ*, VI.4, and VII.11, where the One Enlightener (*eka sambodhoyit*), the Single Tree (*eka aśvattha*), is called an 'everlasting basis for the vision of Brahman'. From the standpoint of comparative religion, from His point of view who 'left not himself without a witness', Acts XIV.17, and however distasteful this may be to individual persuasion, the Messiah is One Person.

That the equivalence of the Vedic and Christian Sons of God, of Horse and Lamb for example, is not even more apparent depends primarily on the diversity of scale in the imagery. The Indian embodiment of the only begotten Son is cosmic: human (*paṇḍasya*) only ideally as Eternal Man, the single mirror of all existences, not human (*māṇasa*) as a man amongst men. Whereas the Christian Son of God is presented historically precisely in the guise of a man amongst men, born of a woman amongst women, in the fashion of terrestrial *avatāras*, having given names, such as Rāma or Gautama. The same applies to every case in which a religion seems to have been established by a single Founder; for example in Buddhism, where we are given to understand that the man Gautama, Siddhārtha, became Comprehensor (Buddha) at a given time and place. These historical and local points of view are later on transcended: and when it has come to be understood that Christ's birth is eternal, that the enlightenment of the Tathāgata 'dates from the beginning of time', then it becomes not merely evident, but can be accepted without anguish, that all alternative-formulations (*pariśya*) are utterances of one and the same Word or Wisdom.

These considerations are of paramount importance for a correct comparative theology. For on the one hand the Year, Brahmā-Prajāpati, is no more and no less a 'demiurge' than is Christ-Logos 'who causes the whole emanation' and 'effects all things', Eckhart, I.130 and 382⁵⁴: and on the other, the conception of this Christ, this Brahmā as the only begotten is affirmed—'he could never have had but one Son for he is none other than his understanding. Had he a thousand sons they must needs be all the same Son', Eckhart, I.131, that holds for the Prajāpatis and Buddhas of countless aeons, for Prajāpati, Tammuz, Herakles, Horus, Christ, or 'Idea of Muḥammad' in any one aeon. Far too much stress has been laid upon the humanity of Jesus: it were better to remember his perfection.⁵⁵ What he took on was not 'man', but human nature: the nature not of *vis* but of *homo*, no more

⁵⁴Likewise no more and no less 'demiurge' than is the 'Perfect Man' (*al-insānu'l-kāmil*) of Islamic theology, viz., Allāh's Word or Fiat (*omni*) and Spirit (*rūh*) manifested in the transcendental being of the Prophet (Muḥammad) as the principle and archetype of all existences.

⁵⁵'Good, pious souls, are hindered too from their proper object by lingering with holy joy over the human form of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . To them his manhood is a hindrance so long as they cling to it with mortal pleasure; they ought to follow God in all his ways and not keep solely to his way of manhood who reveals to us the way of Godhood', Eckhart, I.187.

masculine than feminine. 'Thou art woman, thou art man . . . the seasons and the seas', *Svetāsvatara Uṅ.*, IV.3-4 (cf. *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*, II.3.5): 'This champion or lion is no man or woman, but he is both', Böhme, *Signatura Rerum*, XI.43. Far too much stress has been laid upon his birth in Galilee: in reality 'there is no time where this birth befalls', 'this birth remains in the Father eternally . . . who utters in one single Word the whole of what he knows, the whole of what he can afford, in one single instant, and that instant is eternal.' Eckhart, I.81 and 192: 'It knew, indeed, itself, viz., that, "I am Brahman"; thereby it became the All', *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṅ.*, I.4.10. Conceive Him then not as a man but as Universal Man, Person, Fire, or Light: or for easier comparison, as the Lamb of God, for it may be easier to see that sacrificial lamb and sacrificial horse or bull are equivalent illuminations of the understanding. Agnus Dei, Agni Deva.

As for *mithuna*, 'progenitive pair', and *maithuna*, 'begetting': generation can only be spoken of with reference to the interaction of conjoint principles, these being here, as also in Christian theology, the Knower and the Known, the Act and the Potentiality of Understanding: 'the Holy Ghost was gotten in the Word with this same Intellect', Eckhart, I.381 and 407, 'that by which the Father begets is the divine nature . . . as being that by which the generator generates', St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, I, Q. 41, A. 5. Our text takes for granted the second of the conjoint principles, the unuttered Word or Understanding, *vāc*: but we know from other and abundant sources that She is the divine Nature, Prakṛti, Aditi, Virāj, the Waters. She is the silence in Godhead, every possibility and promise of existence, his means whereby, the inexhaustible well of his abundance. But inasmuch as God and Godhead, Heaven and Earth, essence and nature are one in Him, it is an emission of seed not alone on the part of Intellect, pregnancy not only in the Word that has to be understood: it is Deity, not any one of Persons separately that is pregnant, 'He' brings forth.

Retas, 'seed', is not only poured forth, but becomes the begotten offspring, and so for example we speak of the 'seed of Abraham': compare the account of generation in the *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*, II.5, and the Self-identity (constituted) of father and son asserted here and elsewhere. The child is 'not any new thing, but the very seed of man and woman, and is only bred forth in the mixture, and so only a twig groweth out of the tree', Böhme, *XL Questions concerning the Soul*, VIII.18. In the *Āitareya Uṅ.*, IV.1, *retas*, seed is identified with *tejas*, the Fiery-Energy: elsewhere, e.g. *Mānava Dharmasāstra* I.8, *vīrya*, 'virility', 'virtue', is synonymous. Seed was probably regarded as the vehicle of Spirit, *prāṇa*, for 'it is *prāṇa*, verily the Self as pure Intelligence, that grasps and animates the flesh', *Kaṇṣitaki Uṅ.*, III.3: that comes very near to the Christian point of view, 'the formation of the body taken by the Son is attributed to the Holy Ghost . . . just as the power of the soul which is in the semen, through the spirit enclosed therein, fashions the body in the generation of other men', St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, III, Q. 32, A.1.⁵⁶

⁵⁶On the significance of the begetting of a son, see *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VII.19 (*HOS*, vol. 25, pp. 299, 300).

Whether the Persons of the Trinity are rightly named: though there is not a 'real', but only a possible relationship of Persons in Deity antecedent to procession, *sobus ante principium*, all tradition is agree that the notion of generation, taken from our knowledge of living things, is with respect to the Son analogically appropriate.⁵⁷ Consistency then requires diversity of sex in the conjoint principles invoked: as explicitly in our Upaniṣad, I.5.7, 'The Father is Intellect (*manas*), the Mother Wisdom (*vāc*), the Child Spirit (*prāṇa*).'⁵⁸ Wisdom, *vāc*, is rightly feminine in Vedic thought, for She is the divine nature, the Waters antecedent to their counter-shining, *mūla-prakṛti*, dark undifferentiated, passive Godhead: not distinct from the Father in the Unity, but distinguished from him in the eternal act of generation, as the sea is from the sun. So the Mother is the second Person of the Vedic Trinity, as the Son, the Year, Prajāpati, is logically the third. Spirit, *prāṇa*, is not here a distinct Person, but primarily an essential name of the Father; and in hypostasis, an essential name of the Son. The procession of the Spirit is naturally a spiration (*samirāṇa*): but when Spirit, Life, becomes an essential name of the Son, then the procession, *īpso facto*, must be called a filiation. In this sense the birth of the Son is a divided act, 'I proceeded out of the mouth of the Most High, to wit out of the natural conception of the essential word of the divine Father', Eckhart, I.269; and in Islamic theology, the Idea of Muḥammad is at once the Spirit of Allāh and his son.⁵⁹

Vedic Logos doctrine is better reflected in Greek than in orthodox Christian doctrine.⁶⁰ The problem is too complex for full discussion here, but

⁵⁷For example, 'God's speaking is his child-bearing', St. Augustine; 'The Word proceeding is properly called begotten and Son . . . conception and birth', St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, I, Q. 27, A. 2. *Sobus ante principium* = *pūrva apravartin*, *Kaṇṣitaki Uṅ.*, IV.5.

⁵⁸Also *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṅ.*, I.4.17, *prāṇa praṇā*, and *Taittirīya Uṅ.*, I.3.3.

To render *vāc* consistently by one and the same English word would be impossible. A distinction of *vāc*, synonymous with Sarasvatī in *Rgveda*, I.3.12, and representing an aspect of Māyā, Prakṛti, Śakti, Omnipotentia, from *vāc*, 'word' or 'language' must be clearly recognized. In the beginning, as conjoint principle with Intellect, *Vāc* is Sophia, Dante's 'wisdom': 'in highest praise of Wisdom, I say that she is the mother of all first principles, affirming that she was with God when in the beginning he made the world, and specially the movement of the heaven which engenders all things, whereby every other movement is originated and set going; adding, "she was the thought of Him who set the universe in motion"; I mean that she was in the divine thought, which is very intellect, when He made the world. Whence it follows that she made it; and therefore Solomon on the book of *Proverbs* says speaking in the person of Wisdom, "When God prepared the heavens, I was there, when he fenced the depths with a fixed law and a fixed circle, when He set fast the firmaments above, when He hung aloft the fountains of the waters, when he encircled the sea with its boundary, and laid down a decree for the waters that they should not pass their borders, when he laid the foundations of the earth, I was with Him disposing all things, and I took my pleasure every day", *Convivio*, III.15; cf. *Rgveda*, X.71 and X.95.

⁵⁹Jili, on Qur'ān, II.14.23f., cited by Nicholson, *Studies* . . . p. 113.

⁶⁰For Heraclitus (who was regarded by St. Justin as a 'Christian before Christ') the Logos, manifesting as Fire, is that universal principle which animates and rules the

it may be pointed out that Vedic *ṛtam* and *dharma* are 'neuter' (*aiśvya*, 'without specific gender', but not excluding possibility of gender), and are to be thought of as essential names equivalent to later Brahman and the Imperishable-Word (*akṣaram*) OM, also epicene: in other words, the Indian Logos doctrine neither excludes the unity of Essence and Nature, nor their distinction as conjoint principles linked in joint procession by way of generation or utterance.

It will be understood that Vedic 'theology' takes account of two distinct Trinities. In the one arrangement (Agni, Āditya, Vāyu; Rudra, Viṣṇu, Brahmā) the Persons are distinguished by their natures (the characteristic *guṇas* being *tamas*, *sattva*, and *rajās*); the names are essential and the relations mutual and reversible, so that any two may be thought of as aspects or emanations of the first, there being no logical order of manifestation. In the other arrangement (Supernal Sun and Waters—or Heaven and Earth—and Agni Vaiśvānara or Āyus; Śiva, Śakti, Kumāra; Manas, Vāc, Prāṇa, etc.), the persons are distinguished by naturally progenerative relationships, *guā* Father, Mother, and Offspring, the names take on a more personal character, and there is a logical order of procession. The Christian and Indian Trinities can only be rightly compared when it is realized that while the Christian Father, Son, and Spirit correspond directly to Āditya, Agni Vaiśvānara, and Vāyu (procession being by way of utterance or spiration, not a generation), Father and Son, when the latter is spoken of as begotten by generation from 'conjoint principles' (St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, I, Q. 27, A. 2), or as 'his understanding of himself', correspond also to Manas and Prāṇa, and to Agni and Agni Vaiśvānara ('born of the Waters' or 'born of Earth', and whose nature is exemplary). There is lacking, then, in the Christian formulation, when the Son is thought of as natural and begotten, that Person who should be the second of the 'conjoint principles', which principles can be no other than his Essence and his Nature; no 'wisdom' or 'Nature', corresponding to Vāc or Prakṛti, is recognized as a world. This non-dualistic point of view is more fully developed by the Stoics, in a fashion again suggesting Indian contacts: according to them 'God did not make the world as an artisan does his work, but it is by wholly penetrating all matter that He is the demiurge of the universe (Galen, *De genal. incorp.* in *Fr. Stoic.* ed. von Arnim, II.6); He penetrates the world "as honey does the honeycomb" (Tertullian, *Adv. Hermogenem*, 44); this God so intimately mingled with the world is fire or ignited air; inasmuch as He is the principle controlling the universe, He is called *Logos*; and inasmuch as He is the germ from which all else develops, He is called the *seminat* *Logos* (*Logos spermatikos*). This *Logos* is at the same time a force and a law, an irresistible force which bears along the entire world and all creatures to a common end, an inevitable and holy law from which nothing can withdraw itself, and which every reasonable man should follow willingly' (Cleanthus, *Hymn to Zeus* in *Fr. Stoic.*, I.527-37). Conformably to their exegetical habits the Stoics made of the different gods personifications of the Logos, e.g. of Zeus, and above all of Hermes', *Catholic Encyclopedia*, S.V. Logos.

The correspondence and probable connection of this ideology with that of the Upaniṣads is obvious. The more special application of Cleanthus may be likened to the Buddhist concept of *dharma-cakra pravartana*.

Person in the Christian arrangement of God. It is true that Christ takes on fleshly nature from—'is natured by'—the Virgin Mary, and that she is therefore called the 'Mother of God', but that is not with respect to his eternal procession, merely with respect to the accident of his birth in Galilee. Abstracted from eventful generation, Christ is motherless. It is only in effect and tacitly, if not under protest, that with the Assumption and Coronation of the virgin, and Mariolatry generally, that Mother Nature, Wisdom, *natura naturans*, Prakṛti, Vāc, Māyā, is restored to her numinous bridal throne.

That is made explicit when Eckhart says that 'it is God who has the treasure and the bride in him', I.381, 'the Godhead wantons with the Word, I.388, 'from the Father's embrace of his own nature comes the eternal playing of the Son', I.148, 'where personal understanding keeps to its unity of nature and has intercourse therewith, there the Father-nature has maternal names and is doing mother's work, for it is exclusively mother's work to receive the seed of the eternal Word', and in the divine light 'stood Mary always, bearing her divine child', I.404, as naturally follows if we take it that Christ's birth is eternal.⁶¹ Nothing here contradicts that the Spirit is the common spiration, common love and mutual regard of the Three Persons.

With our Upaniṣad, I.1.2, *tasya samudra yoniḥ*, 'in the sea is his womb', may be compared St. Augustine, *Sermones*, 124, *processit . . . de utero virginis*; Eckhart's 'in the bare chamber of the virgin heart of their chosen vessel Mary . . . out of chaos a shining spiritual soul emerged', I.463.464; and Petrarch, *Virgine bella, che di sol vestita, coronata di stelle, al sommo sole piacessi si che 'n te sua luce ascose*, . . . to the Supernal Sun thou didst seem so fair, that in thee he hid his Light', a noteworthy parallel to the many Vedic passages in which the Angels are represented as seeking for the hidden Sun or Fire, and finding him reflected or brought to birth in the Waters. Dante, 'Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son . . . fixed goal of the eternal counsel . . . in thy womb was lit again the love under whose heat in the eternal peace this flower unfolded', *Paradiso*, XXXIII. A 'Tanurik' ideology of this kind is characteristically developed in the gnostic conception of Sophia as a primordial Aeon, and especially in Valentinian gnosticism, where the Propater Bythos has for his 'śakti' Ennoia, 'Thought', or Sige, 'Silence', from whom are begotten Nous and Aletheia as first principles of manifestation. Finally, it may be observed that in the systematic language of the *Bṛhad-Devatā* and *Nirukta*, the Father would be called a celestial, the Mother a chthonic, and the Son an aerial divinity.

'For as long as is the year': that long time would be the same as the 'night' of the deep sleep of Brahman, as distinguished from the following 'day' or 'year' of the Brahman's waking, during which the horse runs free, as

⁶¹Eckhart speaks of the 'maternal names' of God in two different senses: when he calls him the 'Mother of all things', that is not in the present sense of 'natural parent', but in that 'he stays with all creatures to keep them in being', I.427. That would be in Indian terms, in his Person as Viṣṇu, or as in our text, 7, where he 'remembers' (*manvata*) all existences for as long as time endures: that in scientific phraseology is the 'conservation of energy', cf. Note 78.

explained in the seventh stanza. Cf. *Mānava Dharmasāstra*, I.12, *tasminnanḍe sa bhagavānustivā parivāstaram*.

'The Year is Prajāpati', *Maitrī Up.*, I.5.14: 'the Year, verily, is Prajāpati, is Time (*kāla*),⁶² the nesting-place (*nīda*) of Brahman, Self . . . this formal Time is the great ocean of begotten existences (*prajā*) . . . this whole universe here, and whatsoever of weal or woe may be seen therein . . . he who offers and likewise he who receives the offerings . . . Viṣṇu, Prajāpati', *Maitrī Up.*, VI.15-16, 'for the Brahman has two forms, Time (*kāla*) and the Timeless (*akāla*)', *ibid.*

That is, while the Son 'remains within as essence and goes forth as Person . . . things flowed forth finite into time while abiding infinite in eternity . . . in this image, everything is God; sour and sweet, good and bad, all are one in this image', Eckhart, I.271.285-286.

'Death yawned upon him',⁶³ that is upon the newborn Year, now God has taken on mortality, *nirīṭim ā viveśa*, *Rgveda*, I.164.32: existence, life, is a modality of being naturally subject to mortality, 'sure is death for the born, sure is birth for the dead', *Bhagavad Gītā*, II.27, cf. the vision of Deity there as all-devouring Time, Ch. XI.

'He gave out a cry': viz., 'the hidden name whereby thou didst beget all that is and shall be', *Rgveda*, X.55.2, wording (*vāc*) is indeed his Word (*vāc*), *Bṛhadāranyaka Up.*, I.1.1, Cf. *Rgveda*, I.163.1, 'Thy great birth from the Pleroma (*prīṣa*) and from the sea (*samudra*), O Steed, is to be magnified, in that thou didst neigh (*abruvada*) when first born, whose are the wings of the falcon and the limbs of the deer'; and *Taittirīya Samhitā*, IV.2.8, 'When first thou didst cry on birth, a rising from the sea, the foam, that is thy famed birth, O Steed.' 'In the beginning this (universe) was unuttered (*avyākṛta*)', *Maitrī Up.*, VI.6; but by that utterance (*vyākṛti*) of Prajāpati's, in which all things are called by their essential names,⁶⁴ their existence was poured forth (*asṛgram*),⁶⁵

⁶²Kāla, our 'Father Time', but here essentially, not as now merely allegorically.

⁶³Represented in the later iconography by the demons Madhu and Kaiabha, threatening Brahmā, lotus-seated and navel-born from Nārāyaṇa.

⁶⁴Utterance, *vyākṛti*, is that of the Three Worlds, as explained in the *Maitrī Up.*, VI.6; these worlds, this universe, being the body (*tanu*, *śarīra*) of Prajāpati, the Horse, the Tree, the Wheel, the Dance of Śiva.

The analysis of the singular name or utterance into its manifold aspects is the creative function of the poetic genius, imagination, or prophecy, expressed primarily in the sacrificial chants. Cf. 'When, O Bṛhaspati, calling things by their names (Prophets), put forth the head and front of Wisdom (*vāc*), then what was best and flawless in them, hid in the innermost (*guhā*), that by their love (*preman*) they brought to light . . . by Intellect (*manas*) they dealt with Wisdom (*vāc*), hence it is said that 'by the Sacrifice they found the tracks of wisdom, within the Prophets (*ṛṣ*) lodged', *Rgveda*, X.71.3: for 'whom I (viz., Wisdom, *vāc*) love, him I make forceful, Brahman, Prophet, and very wise', *ibid.*, X.125.5. Access to this unspoken Wisdom in the innermost, is spoken of as vision and audition (*-dṛś* and *-śṛ*), *ibid.*, X.71.4, hence the later designation of the Veda as *śruti*, 'that which was heard'.

⁶⁵*Ṛṣiḥ, asṛjata, asṛgram*, etc., ought not to be translated as 'creation' and 'created'. For though *ṛj* may denote the same as *kr*, the connotation is quite different, in the first

'for all these existences are Principles (*manas*, 'Intellect'),⁶⁶ *Pāñcarvīśā Brāhmaṇa*, VI.9.14-20. 'One should know that all these verses (*ṛc*), all these Vedas, all sounds, are merely one Utterance (*vyākṛti*), verily Spiration (*prāṇa*), Spiration verily the verses', *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, II.2.2. Just as in Christianity, 'God spake never a word but one', Eckhart, I.148, 'in this only Word he spoke all things', I.377, for 'the Word of the Father is his understanding of himself', I.146, 'the Father spoke himself and all creatures in the Word . . . to all creatures in his Son', I.377, or again 'First out of the Father there leaps forth the Son, small but so puissant in his Godly strength that it is he who causes the whole emanation. The second sally is the premier angel, following hard upon the first event. It speeds apace . . . so charged with power that given a thousand or more worlds they would be wanting in capacity ere the first issue had been spent . . . One unique throw with the world a sheet of water and the water would fail ere the circles died away', Eckhart, I.130.

He, Death bethought himself: "Verily, if I shall intend against him. I shall make the less food for myself". With that Word by that Self, he poured forth (*asṛjata*) all This, whatsoever: the Rg, the Yajur, and the Sāma Vedas, metres, sacrifice, men and beasts.

Whatsoever he poured forth, that he began to eat (*ad*). Verily he devours (*ad*) everything: that is the Liberty (*adītiya*) of Aditi. He who knows thus the Liberty of Aditi becomes an eater of all things here, everything becomes his food (*anna*). 5.

case to 'pour out', 'emanate', in the second to 'make', 'create', 'fashion'. Thus *ṛj* and *kr* are the terms proper respectively to metaphysical, and to dualistic parlance, and they should not be confused in translation. For *ṛj*, etc., English 'emanated', 'outpoured', 'outflown', etc., are immediately available.

The root *ksar* in the transitive sense of to 'pour-forth' is similarly employed in connection with the notion of Utterance (*vyākṛti*), *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, II.2.2: in that he pours-forth (*ksarati*) gifts, and none can exceed this his generosity, a syllable is 'akṣara'. Or *ksar* being intransitively in the sense of to 'flow away', or 'perish', *akṣara* means 'imperishable', and especially 'the Imperishable-Word', OM. 'Creation', in other words, is fatal, its flux is never diminished: the plenitude (*pūrṇa, bhūman*) of the unity-of-potentiality-and-act is infinite, 'The yon is all, and this is all, take all from all, withdrawing all from all, still over and above remains the all', *Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa*, XIV.8.1 = *Bṛhadāranyaka Up.*, V.1, cf. *Atharvaveda*, X.8.29.

Nor should *bhūta*, literally 'that which has come into existence', although equivalent to Christian 'creature', be so translated, nor even as 'being'; for in the first place, existences are generally spoken of in Vedic texts as 'emanated', rather than as 'created', and in the second, while it is true that all existences have being, not all being has existence. A common equivalent of *bhūta* as 'an existence' is *satva*, cf. below, p. 80. *Bhū* = werden, *sthā* = *existere*.

⁶⁶Here 'Principles' seems to convey the sense rather better than 'Intellect', though both amount to the same thing. We take for granted the definition, 'Intellect is the habit of First Principles', and Eckhart, I.74, 'Intellect is a matter of pure being'. Will and Intellect the gateway (*mukha, dvāra*) of procession (*prasaraṇa*).

The first part continues the thought of the preceding stanza, and needs little explanation. 'The less food', i.e. the less life. 'With that Word, by that Self', viz., from the mouth of the Year, Prajāpati, and here we must understand a neighing of the Horse.

'That he began to eat': that is Death, Godhead, began to live, to exist as God: as we have already seen, God's existent being depends on his existent world no less than its existent being depends on him, each pre-supposes the other. Not in causal relation, but in reciprocity and simultaneity, here there is no distinction save outpouring and outpoured . . . they are one God . . . begotten and suddenly begotten', Eckhart, I.72.

It is that same fiery mouth that utters all existences, and whereunto they hasten back; in our Upaniṣad, I.1.1, 'Universal Fire his open mouth',⁶⁷ cf.

⁶⁷Here some further light can be thrown upon the terms corresponding to East and West, Upper and Nether, discussed above, p. 47, Note 49. In the epic account of the Churning of the Ocean, the stallion Uccaiṣravas, the same as our Cosmic Horse, is called Vāḍabābharty, 'the Mare's Husband': cf. the Vedic myth of Saranyū = Apṛyā, upon whom the Sun (Vivasvat) in the form of a stallion begets the Āsins (*Rgveda*, X.13.4, etc., see Bloomfield in *J.A.O.S.*, vol. 15, pp. 172ff.). It follows that the Mare's mouth (*vadabābhartya*) and Fire beneath the Waters at the southern pole (Nadir) must correspond to the Stallion's fiery mouth in our Upaniṣad, I.1.1.1, and I.2.9. In the first of these passages his front (*pūruva*) part is *udyan*, his rear (*aparva*) part *nimlocan*, in the second the head is *prācī*, the tail *prācī*. The correspondence of *pūruva* and *prācī*, and the equivalence of their various meanings in other contexts, will not be overlooked. In *Rgveda*, X.72.9, *pūruvas* beyond doubt 'above', as well as 'primordial' and 'ancient', or even 'eternal'. Any term representing the antithesis to *aparva* should, further, be equivalent to '*para*'. *Udyan* and *nimlocan* indeed imply the places of the rising and setting of the Sun, and so with respect to terrestrial conditions may rightly be rendered as 'East' and 'West'. But it is clear from the correspondences tabulated above, and in the previous note that the Supernal-Sun Āditya, is thought of as 'rising' by the Zenith, and 'setting' in the Nadir, as indeed would be required in doctrine of 'light and reflection', *prakāśa-vimarsa*, as in *Kaṇṣāṭaki Uṣ.*, IV.2, *āditye mahat . . . ādarsē prācīnūpāḥ*, and as discussed on p. 35. It follows that all our terms denoting East and West here mean Upper and Nether *there*. *Uttara* is the superlative of *ud*, 'up'.

It also follows that *uttara* and *dakṣiṇa*, respectively 'northern' and 'southern' here stand for 'Upper', and 'Nether' *there*. For as the 'Mare's mouth' is *dakṣiṇa*, the Stallion's mouth must be *uttara*. That not only throws light on the use of these terms in connection with the *devayāna* and *pitṛyāna*, but shows that *uttara yuga* in *Rgveda*, X.72.1 = *pūruva yuga*, *ibid.*, 9, and that both imply the *parama vyoman*, super-celestial Empyrean. Similarly in the *Rgveda*, X.90.5, *paścād pūrah* is both 'from East to West', and 'from Zenith to Nadir': His body necessarily extends from the Upper to the Nether Waters, for all existence is contained in the intervening-space (*antarākāśa*), and we have already deduced that his head is above, and that also appears in that his eye is the Supernal-Sun.

Pūruva, by contrast with *apūruva*, 'latent', has also the sense of 'immediate', that is 'within you', cf. *brahman nāhitam gahvīyam parama vyoman*, *Taittirīya Uṣ.*, II.1. cf. 'when I say the highest I mean the innermost', Eckhart, I.164. So Dakṣiṇūnūrti, 'He whose aspect is turned southward', and is therefore thought of as looking from the north,

Maitrī Uṣ., VI.2, 'all-devouring Time', *Bhagavad Gītā*, XI.32, *kālō smi . . . lokān samāhartum iha pravṛttah*, 'I am come-forth as Time, for the destruction of the worlds', and *Rgveda*, I.164.44, 'one of these (Agni) mows down at the end of the year'.

implies also 'He who looks from above downwards' and 'He who looks from within outwards.' Cf. also *Mundaka Uṣ.*, II.2.21, where again 'west to east' and 'south to north' are the same as 'below to above'; and *Atharvaveda*, VIII.9.8, *paścāt*, 'from within'.

All this is in fact far more a psychology of space than a cosmology: from Upper to Nether is from the Within to the Without, from knowing subject to known object, from the centre to the felly of the World-wheel. The 'back' or 'surface' of the Waters must not be understood too literally to mean an actually horizontal or anywise oriented plane, for the Waters are all the possibilities of existence on any plane, pervading measureless space in the lotus of the heart. Proof positive that the 'cosmology' is a psychology can be found in the *Chāndogya Uṣ.*, III.10.1.1, where it becomes entirely a question of one's spiritual condition whether the sun rises in the East, South, West, or North, until for the Sādhyas it rises in the Zenith and sets in the Nadir, and finally 'for those who know the essential truth (*upanisat*) of Brahman, the Supernal-Sun, risen in the Zenith, stands there in the middle, neither setting nor rising (*na nimloca nōdhyāya*), but evermore high-noon (*sahya divā*)', and *ibid.*, VIII.4.2, 'ever illumined (*sahya vibhātah*) is this Brahma world'. Precisely the same point of view is indicated in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III.44, 'indeed he never sets, union with him and identity of form and world he attains who knows thus'. Cf. Eckhart, I.86, 'the soul mounts up in this light into space, to the zenith at high noon' the morning light being God, the evening light the light of nature and noon the light of their identity: Ruysbroeck, 'when Christ the Divine Sun has risen in the Zenith of our hearts . . . then . . . He will draw all things to Himself'. Just as also in Islamic theology, the eye (*hamam*) of the heart (*qalb* = *hrd*) is variously oriented in men of different spiritual degree, but the heart of the Comprehensor has no face or back, 'these men face with their whole being the whole of the Divine names and attributes and are with God essentially', Nicholson, *Studies* . . . p. 114, Note 3, cf. Böhme, *Signatura Rerum*, VII.38, 'Now wilt thou be a magus? Then thou must understand how to change the night again into day'.

On the other hand, what is called the 'ordinary view' of the Brāhmaṇas, viz., that the Sun is born of the Fire, and sets in the Fire, e.g., *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VIII.28, refers to the Procession and Recession of the Supernal-Sun as one of the Several Angels of the Trinity, as in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Uṣ.*, I.2.2 and 3. Again in *Rgveda*, I.35.3, where Savitṛ moves 'by the height and by the depth' (*pravatā, ubhayatā*), coming 'hither from afar' (*duritā*), illuminating not merely the earth but all the worlds, and is called the axis of the wheel whereby the angels are supported, it is certainly not the physical Sun that is intended, but the Supernal-Sun 'whose paths are twain, an inner and an outer', as in *Maitrī Uṣ.*, VI.1, translated below. All these risings and settings take place *antarbhūtasya kṣe, hṛdayāśāsā*, i.e. 'Within you', 'in the heart-space', that is at the same time in the Waters, in the Sea (*Rgveda*, IV.58.1, *samudra hrđi*, cf. *Chāndogya Uṣ.*, VIII.1.3, 'everything here is contained within it'); and endeavours (e.g. Speyers in *J.R.A.S.*, 1906, 723f.) to interpret 'scientifically' are beside the mark: the 'science' here is not astronomical, but psychological and ontological. Nothing can be less scientific than to

