लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी
L.B.S. National Academy of Administration
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE
पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY
अवाप्ति संख्या
Accession No. — 102147
वर्ग संख्या
Class No. 294.59218
पुस्तक संख्या
Book No. Tea

GL 294.59218
TEA
102147
LBSNAA



LONDON AGENTS
SIMPKIN MARSHALL LTD

The Secret Lore of India

and

The One Perfect Life for All

being

A Few Main Passages from the Upanishads

Put into English Verse with
An Introduction & A Conclusion

by

W. M. Teape

M.A., Edin. and Camb.; B.D., Camb.
Formerly Vicar of Ford in the Diocese of Durham

CAMBRIDGE
W. HEFFER & SONS LTD.
1932

PRINTED IN ENGLAND

Foreword

THIS is the first fruits of a life-long study of the foundations of Eastern and Western Religious Thought. How the author was led to the study is described in the Preface.

It is a parallel presentation of these Foundations and a consideration of their relation to each other.

So far as the writer knows, this has not yet been done. He has looked in vain for any who might have assisted him in his task. Apparently he is a pioneer.

His position is easily accounted for. It was only toward the close of the eighteenth century that the intrepid Sir William Jones,[1] through his acquirement of a knowledge of Sanskrit, rendered the language and literature of the ancient Hindus accessible to European scholars, and only at the close of the nineteenth, that the documents that give the religious thought thereof began to be published in a European tongue. All through the hundred years that thus passed the elements and character of that religious thought were a problem and constitute a problem still.[2] Even the course of the stages that led up to the Secret Lore is not clear. The author gives here the course of thought as it seems probable to him after his searching the works of our latest scholars. Happily for his purpose, however, the character of thought when the Secret Lore arose and what that Secret Lore was, taken in its simple meaning, are clear. It is rather the implications the Secret Lore involves that constitute the problem with regard to it. Also, it brings with it subsidiary questions galore.

The difficulty in such a task as the author's is to know when to stop and sum up one's discoveries. There is so much to investigate and think over. Yet for an explorer, even though much more may lie ahead, it is well to halt now and then and take measure of what he has gained. So the writer deems himself fortunate to have come to possess a friend who urged him, for a certain reason, to put his pen

[1] Judge of the High Court at Calcutta.

[2] See Dr. E. J. Thomas in his Foreword to V. G. Rele's *Vedic Gods*.

to paper and write out largely as he could his discoveries. The result is this work. It is accordingly, as has been said, a first ingathering. It looks, if life and ability be granted, to further researches. One cannot but hope for the better fortune still, that readers of the book will be attracted to join the adventure.

However, if the general task of the author proved to be a lone employ, it was happily not so with his adoption of the mode in which he here presents his "Selections from the Secret Lore." He had long known of John Muir's *Metrical Translations from Sanskrit Writers*, and it was Paul Eberhardt's *Der Weisheit Erster Schluss* that showed him how the versification should be done. Eberhardt's renderings confirmed the conviction he himself had by experiment arrived at, that verse brings out, as cold prose cannot do, the true sense and impress of what these teachers have to tell.

The Selections naturally are the *pièce de résistance* of the Book, and to enable their understanding the author has added a few notes and a Vocabulary of certain important Sanskrit terms.

This Main Part of the book is preceded by an Introduction, and followed up by a Conclusion.

The Introduction consists of Two Parts. The Former Part traces the Sacred Tradition from its beginning, on, probably, the now-Hungarian plain, through the Caspian period and the early and late Vedic Period, to the rise of the Secret Lore, which is the climax of the Veda. The Latter Part describes the course of development, as the author finds it, of the Secret Lore itself.

The Conclusion reviews the One Perfect Life of the Christian Faith. For this the author has found statements from Bishop Westcott's writings most helpful.

Further, if the author counts it a good fortune that he should at last have been set down to write, much more does he congratulate himself on the time, as it happens, of the publication of his work. True, the interest now so keenly taken in India is with regard to politics, but it does not take a deep observation to discern that religious ideals are at the base of the discussions of East and West on how to frame a sound and acceptable political structure for the

great sub-continent; and it is the foundations of these ideals that the author presents in this book.

But religious foundations as such are meant to support much more than a political constitution, and the reason why the author is happy that public attention should be drawn to these Eastern foundations is that he believes that they (as he endeavours in this book to show) reveal features, contributed by early and thoughtful men, that give not a little help to the understanding of the foundation the West has accepted, the One Perfect Life, the faith of which, we believe, can alone bring in *all* life's departments peace and progress to the world.

Preface

COMMENCING his Preface, the writer finds it is fifty years since the rubicon was crossed, without which crossing this book could never have been begun.

A venerable missionary from Bombay, the Rev. J. S. S. Robertson, whose name the author would gratefully record, came to spend his closing days near the author's home, and entreated his father to allow him to teach him the Sanskrit letters. Mr. Robertson had brought with him from Hindustan a bundle of reed pens, which he carefully sharpened, taught the present author, then in his nineteenth summer, how to hold, and how therewith to form the letters simple and compound of the sacred tongue. So was the reading of Sanskrit made possible. Those were the days when no one thought of printing Sanskrit in roman characters. Thus was the crossing made.

The campaign, all unexpected then, began, however, only some years after the author's ordination, with a missionary sermon he preached. In it he described the Final Conflict for Christ which he was confident was nigh, even the battle of Armageddon, when the sixth golden bowl of the wrath of God should be poured out and the war of the great day of God the Almighty should begin, foretold in the Revelation of St. John. Where should it be fought and with whom? Plainly in India and with Hinduism Islām and Buddhism.

Such his mind, the preacher recognised that he must try to understand the forces with which the conflict should be.

As his studies went on and the character of the forces to be met was more clearly discerned, Hinduism stood forth as the one power that must be grappled with. That conquered, he saw the Victory of the Cross secure.

To gain knowledge of Hinduism, however, he must evidently be able to read Sanskrit. So he sought out a paper, long forgotten, on which he had in copy the quaint alphabet and certain letters parted into their detail with hints for their composition, laid by since the days when the venerable white-bearded missionary had volunteered to teach him.

He realised now that he had then made a crossing that had brought him into the field where he should both fit himself for the conflict and meet with the foe.

Foe? Yes. At first a foe was this strange untoward power, of whose character he had had some superficial knowledge, and of whose might and temples and idols he had by this time seen something, when, as a traveller ever pushing on, staying a while here and there, he had passed through India, between the incident of the reed pens and the preaching of the missionary sermon. Yet never a bitter foe or regarded with bitterness; and when, as his first experience, again taking up Sanskrit, he found himself learning something of the Upanishads, the instructions given to pupils 'sitting near' ('sitting near' being the literal meaning of the word 'Upanishad') by the Forest Fathers in the distant past, a surmise seized him that this Secret Lore, as it is called on the title page of this book, and as its name 'Upanishad' implies, might contain something worth knowing about. Indeed, as his studies broadened, he discovered to his surprise that many of the world's thinkers he had always understood to be worthy only of condemnation were really friends that were helping him to understand better what he was eager to know. Reparation was needed.

The master that opened the author's eyes to the worth of these Eastern teachings was Deussen. Who that has read that learned Professor's books, heard him speak, or, above all, conversed with him, but has been captured by his enthusiasm? It was well said by a fellow-member of a Conference the writer attended, that Deussen addressed his audience as if he were facing a Methodist meeting. With wonder the present author read through his *Philosophy of the Upanishads* in A. E. Geden's translation, mystified thoroughly, as a tiro, yet every now and then caught up by the thoughts there laid open. Many corrections have had to be made, and are still being made, as to the history and significance of Upanishad thought, but it was to that book of Deussen's that the present author owes the perception of what he believes to be its true message. How many must owe to Deussen the same debt! Further enlightenment as to Upanishad thought was afforded by the perusal of Deussen's remarkable *General Introduction* [*to*

Philosophy] *and Philosophy of the Veda up to the Upanishads.* That is the first volume of Deussen's monumental *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*,[1] a work that delineates both the life and the thought of the world's chief philosophers, well worth reading through, and, so clearly is everything stated, excellent for reference. And what student but finds of great value Deussen's edition of the *Sechzig Upanishad's* with translation analyses and notes?

But if Deussen had brought to the present writer grasp of the message of the Forest Fathers, the learned Professor to whom he owes his first clear general view of the documents of their teaching was R. E. Hume in his translation published in 1921 of the *Thirteen Principal Upanishads*. There, at last, these lay before him in intelligible English, divided into sections, each with its caption. Hume's translation he has taken as the basis for his versification. It would seem as if versification were better than prose for the presentation of the Upanishad announcements. Already, before he came across Eberhardt's work, the author, had felt, as he has stated in his Foreword, that pieces he had versified gave their significance much more truly than if he had written them in the bald wording and style of prose. But rendering into verse required, he soon found, a more thorough sifting of the meaning of words than a colourless prose requires. Besides, the frequently wearisome repetition of the same word, which was the Upanishad teachers' custom, adopted, no doubt, to make their teaching more easily learned and remembered, made it advisable at times to use different allowable renderings. Accordingly, one carefully studied the Sanskrit words in question in A. A. Macdonell's *Dictionary*, the excellent Vocabulary in Lanman's *Sanskrit Reader*, and the great St. Petersburg *Wörterbuch* of Böhtlingk and Roth on which Lanman's Vocabulary is based.

The first two Selections translated in this book are considerably, but, the writer hopes, not erroneously, expanded. Yet, that the reader may judge that for himself, the author has thought it best to give as Appendices I and II a literal translation. No doubt, in these two Selections which are of a mythological character, there is much room for diverse

[1] Full title: *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionen.*

interpretation. Also some little detail has been put in in Selection 16 with regard to the deities there mentioned. The other Selections are pretty well word for word renderings of the original, and it is the author's hope that those who know the original will find it truly conveyed, nothing subverted, but rather the meaning of its terms made clearer by any occasional insertion.

For the ascertaining of the significance of passages the author is much indebted to two Indian scholars, Professors Belvalkar and Ranade, for help derived from the *Creative Period of Indian Philosophy*, written by them conjointly, from Professor Ranade's *Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy*, and from Professor Belvalkar's *Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy*. And who does not at once discover the informative value of Macdonnell's *Vedic Mythology* and Macdonell and Keith's *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, both of which books are frequently cited? The author would express his gratitude also to his friend, Professor Rapson, for encouragement and valuable information gained from what he writes in the great work of which he is editor, the *Cambridge History of India*. He is grateful also to his friend Dr. E. J. Thomas, of the Cambridge University Library, for certain extracts from his booklet of *Vedic Hymns*. He was glad to have similar use of Professor Macdonell's *Hymns from the Rigveda*. Dr. Crespi's well-packed *Contemporary Thought of Italy* he found contained, to his great satisfaction, just the side-lights he wanted from the thought of to-day. Side-lights he also found, as will be observed, from certain English mystic poets.

To all these authorities and to others, duly mentioned in this book, the writer expresses his gratitude.

He would thank these publishers: Herr Eugen Diederich, of Jena, for kind permission to use (in his Selections 1 and 6) portions of Paul Eberhardt's *Der Weisheit Erster Schluss;* and Herr G. Grote, of Berlin, for permission to render into English one or two of Otto von Glasenapp's charming translations in his *Indische Gedichte aus vier Jahrtausenden.*

So much for the Upanishad information given in this book.

What of the exposition of Christian doctrine? For that the author has found as a congenial authority, possessing,

he believes, just the mind and giving just the exposition that facilitate the comparison of the doctrine of our Eastern sages with that of our Christian revelation, Brooke Foss Westcott, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and afterwards Bishop of Durham, under whom he was privileged to serve, a theologian of much influence in his time, whose teaching, both its depth and its breadth, he believes the Church of to-day would do well to treasure and ponder. Here, as side lights, he discovered not only certain mystic English poets, but also our great astronomer, Sir James Jeans, and our inspiring scientist, philosopher, and statesman, General Smuts. For the help thus afforded—the author's gratitude.

It will be observed that the book is in Three Parts. The First is an Introduction in which the progress of the Sacred Tradition is traced from its beginning among the original Indo-European stock, from whom the Āryans, the people of the eventual Sanskrit tongue, are descended, to its culmination in the Secret Lore. The Second Part consists of Specimens of the said Secret Lore, being a few chief passages and some passages that have taken the author's fancy, together with Notes thereon, chiefly modern illustrations, and a Vocabulary of certain important words. The Third Part is a Conclusion, in which he notes how, to his mind, with Westcott to help him in his analysis, the Upanishad fathers are like prospectors who have caught sight, in outline and with not a little mist obscuring their view, what has been revealed in such fulness and clearness to the Christian. Revelation has a history. A waiting of the world had to be until the Fuller Light should break in.

So here is not strife but a recognition of Fellow-seekers after Truth.

Yet a battle there is, and the enemies to be encountered are those mentioned in the Epistle to the Ephesians, "the principalities, the powers, the world-rulers of this darkness, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places,"[1] which beset and hinder the understanding and the endeavours of all men in their pursuit of a life of devotion to the Highest.

Important it is for India, ourselves, and the world that India should have its due place, as a civic entity, in the

[1] Eph. vi. 12.

comity of nations, but how much more important for India, ourselves, and the world, that India have its due place as a spiritual member in the Church of God! To that Westcott gives testimony in our Appendix V, which contains writings of his written before he left Cambridge in 1890. Of special interest and value is the witness we also give, as our Appendix VI, of Sir George Birdwood, who was born in India, for fourteen years held important appointments in Bombay, and, compelled to come to England by ill health, fulfilled thirty years in the India Office, keeping through all his life in close touch with the land of his birth, of whom it is well said[1] that he "clung to the traditional life of India, recognised its marvellous vitality, and interpreted it to the Western mind with a sympathy and knowledge which no contemporary English writer equalled." Sir George's testimony here given appears in *Sva*, a collection of papers he had ear-marked among his many writings for reproduction as being "precious to himself as a record of his progressively wider and clearer 'open vision' of the future of enchanted India."[2] His dedication of his book is dated 8th December, 1914.

W. M. T.

[1] By F. H. Brown, Fellow of the Institute of Journalists, whom Sir George Birdwood requested to edit his book *Sva*. See Mr. Brown's Preface, p. xii. Sir George in his own Preface describes Mr. Brown as "one of the best informed and soundest-minded of living publicists on Indian affairs," p. xvi.

[2] *Sva*, p. xv.

Contents

PAGE

FOREWORD - - - - - - - - - - v

PREFACE - - - - - - - - - - ix

INTRODUCTION: SURVEY OF THE SACRED TRADITION - 1

THE SELECTIONS

BRIEF ADVICE TO THE READER - - - - - - 47

PRONUNCIATION OF SANSKRIT - - - - - - 49

1. THE WORLD AS THE HORSE SACRIFICE - - 50

i. First, External, Aspect: The Horse at Liberty 50

ii. Second, Inner, Aspect: The Horse Slain - - 51

iii. The Source of the Horse - - - - - 52

2. THE EVOLUTION OF THE COSMOS OR THE ATTAINMENT OF A BODY OF COMPLETE SELF-SACRIFICE - - 54

ANALYSIS - - - - - - - - - - 54

A. Introduction - - - - - - - - 56

B. The Process of Evolution - - - - - 56

i. Death at the Beginning - - - 56

ii. The Yearning of Death for a Body - - 57

iii. First Stage of Evolution: The Body of Force 57

iv. Second Stage of Evolution: The Body of Life - - - - - - - - - 60

v. Third Stage of Evolution: The Body of the Spirit - - - - - - - - 67

C. Epilogue on the Two Fires - - - - - 72

(*a*) The Two Fires, One on Earth, the Other in Heaven - - - - - - - - 72

(*b*) The Two Fires are One Divinity - - 76

(*c*) The Triumph of Him who knows this - 76

PAGE

3. THE EMANATIONS FROM AND THE RETURN TO ITSELF OF THE UNITIVE SELF - - - - - - 77
   I. Introduction - - - - - - - - 77
   II. The Descent: Six Increasingly Gross Emanations from the Self: At last—the Person - 77
   III. The Ascent: Five Increasingly Ethereal Persons 78
   IV. Identity with the Sun - - - - - 82
   V. Recapitulation of the Return - - - 82
   VI. The Rapturous Song of the Unitive Self after it has returned to itself - - - - - 83
4. MACROCOSM AND MICROCOSM - - - - - 84
5. THE OPEN WAY AT DEATH - - - - - 86
6. "THE CREED OF ŚĀṆḌILYA" AND "A SONG" THEREON BY PAUL EBERHARDT - - - - - - 87
7. WHAT CERTAIN CREATURES OF THE WILDERNESS TAUGHT SATYAKĀMA - - - - - - - 89
8. HOW SPIRIT BECAME THE ALL - - - - - 95
9. THE SELF CREATIVE - - - - - - - 97
10. THE INSTRUCTION GIVEN BY UDDĀLAKA TO HIS SON ŚVETAKETU - - - - - - - - 99
11. THE BIRD OF PARADISE - - - - - - 115
12. THE INSTRUCTION YĀJNAVALKYA GAVE TO JANAKA, KING OF THE VIDEHAS - - - - - - 117
13. YĀJNAVALKYA'S LAST TESTAMENT - - - - 131
14. THE WORLD BEYOND - - - - - - - 137
15. THE SECRET TEACHING GIVEN TO THE GODS AND DEMONS BY THE LORD OF CREATURES REGARDING THE TRUE SELF - - - - - - - 138
16. THE ADVANTAGE OF KNOWLEDGE OF ONE'S NATURE 146
17. THE EIGHT WARDENS OF THE HEAD - - - 148
18. THE HOMAGE GIVEN BY ALL THINGS TO HIM WHO IN ALL THINGS SEES THE SELF - - - 149
19. THE MEANING OF THE THUNDER - - - 150
20. THE SUPREMACY OF THE REAL - - - - 152
21. THE FALSE IN TRUTH'S EMBRACE - - - 153

PAGE

22. THE SUPREME AUSTERITIES - - - - - 154

23. THE SIN-DETERRENT FIRE - - - - - 155

24. THE NECESSITY THAT THE SELF SHOULD REVEAL ITSELF TO ITSELF - - - - - - 156

NOTES ON THE SELECTIONS - - - - - - 159

VOCABULARY OF SOME IMPORTANT SANSKRIT WORDS - 205

CONCLUSION: THE ONE PERFECT LIFE FOR ALL - - 228

APPENDIX I: LITERAL TRANSLATION OF "THE WORLD AS THE HORSE SACRIFICE" (BAU. I.I.) - - 325

APPENDIX II: LITERAL TRANSLATION OF "THE EVOLUTION OF THE COSMOS" (BAU. I.2.) - - - 326

APPENDIX III: ON "NEPHESH" - - - - - 327

APPENDIX IV: THE SPIRIT - - - - - - 328

APPENDIX V: WESTCOTT ON HINDU THOUGHT IN GENERAL 337

APPENDIX VI: SIR GEORGE BIRDWOOD ON INDIA - 339

INDEX OF UPANISHAD PASSAGES - - - - - 341

INDEX OF ABBREVIATIONS - - - - - - 342

GENERAL INDEX - - - - - - - - 343

Introduction: Survey of the Sacred Tradition

PAGE

I. The Place of the Secret Lore in the Sacred Tradition 2

II. The First Prehistoric Period: The Earliest Indo-European Thought 3

III. The Second Prehistoric Period: The Attainment of the Airya Contingent 6

IV. The Land of the Origin of the Veda 6

V. The New Inspiration.. 9

VI. Its Strength 11

VII. Its Exalted Character 13

VIII. Its Objective Fulness 13

IX. The Age of the Poets 14

(i) The Growing Preference for the God of Battle .. 14

(ii) The Increase in the Number of Officiants and the Rise of Hereditary Bodies with Special Functions 15

(iii) A Deteriorating Influx 16

(*a*) The Influx 16

(*b*) The Content of the Influx 17

(*c*) The Source of the Influx.. 17

(iv) Presentiments of Unity 18

(v) The Elevation of the Sacrifice 19

X. The Age of the Omnipotence of the Magic and Acquisitive Ritual 20

(i) The Arrival at the Strait of Fertile Land before the Watershed between West and East was arrived at 20

(ii) The Change in the People 20

(iii) The Cessation of the Poetry 21

(iv) The Formation of the Rigveda 21

(v) Two New Vedas 21

(vi) The Forming of the Commentaries 22

(vii) The Region of this Compilation of the Hymns and Commencement of Commentaries on the Ritual .. 22

(viii) The Expansion of the Commentaries 22

(ix) The Change of Character in the Mind of the Priest and of the Significance of the Ritual 23

(x) The Power of the Sacrifice in the World 24

(xi) The Decline of the Gods 25

(xii) Summary of the Change in Religion 26

(xiii) The Decline of Philosophy 26

PAGE

XI. THE ESCAPE IN THE UPANISHADS FROM THE MAGIC AND ACQUISITIVE RITUAL TO THE GLORY OF THE SELF, THE SPIRIT 27

Seven Steps :

(i) The First Step: The Actual takes the place of the Symbol 28
(ii) The Second Step: The Two Inheritances brought forward 30
(*a*) The Prayer-force 30
(*b*) The World-Person, the Puruṣa .. 31
(iii) The Third Step: The Actualising of the Prayer-force .. 32
(iv) The Fourth Step: The Actualising of the World-Person .. 35
(v) The Fifth Step: The thorough De-objectifying of the Prayer-force and the Person 36
(vi) The Sixth Step: Being is the World and the Self .. 37
(vii) The Seventh and Final Step: The Self is Being and is Spirit 39
(*a*) The Self 40
(*b*) The Spirit 42
(*c*) The Reality of the World 44

XII. THE NECESSITY THAT THE SELF TRANSCENDENT SHOULD ENABLE THE SELF IN THE FLESH TO KNOW ITS TRUE NATURE 45

XIII. RECAPITULATION 45

I. THE PLACE OF THE SECRET LORE IN THE SACRED TRADITION.

The Secret Lore, which we here present specimens of, is handed down in a series of documents called Upanishads, that is 'sittings down-near,' because their contents were transmitted as a secret to a student who sat close to his teacher. The teaching was imparted by divines ('men of the spirit,' as they were called) to those of their own caste who had undergone a long course of discipline, and whom the teacher thought fit to receive it. It was given long ago, about the middle of the first millenium before Christ, that is about the time of Jeremiah the prophet in Judah, and was the Climax of a course of development of religious thought that had begun a thousand years previously.

It is to be remembered that all dates, however, in this story are conjectures within wide limits. The basis of the conjectures is linguistic evidence we shall presently describe, besides internal evidence in pre-Upanishad and Upanishad documents themselves. A prime fact to keep fixed in mind is that the Upanishads were concluded before the classic Buddhist doctrines were formed.

II. The First Prehistoric Period: The Earliest Indo-European Thought.

Let us consider the linguistic evidence to which we have just referred.

It so happens that those ancient people of India among whom this development of thought took place spoke a language (and their multitudinous descendants in India still speak daughter-tongues thereof) that is plainly kindred to practically all the languages spoken in Europe to-day. These languages, taken all together, are consequently called Indo-European.

It has therefore been of interest to scholars to try, by comparing these so evidently cognate languages and sifting out what is common to them all, to discover what the original tongue might be from which they are derived, and from words thus found to ascertain, as far as possible, what was the home of those who spoke the original language, what their stage of civilisation, their character, and their religion.

It will accordingly be useful for us who are about to study the course of early Indian thought, to have the results of the investigations of these scholars before us, for we shall then ascertain the sort of life and thought from which ultimately the Indian thought of our study is derived.

First then, with regard to the home of these people, the learned philologist, Dr. Giles, having gone through their vocabulary, conjectures it to be a varied country, for their vocabulary shows that they had not only to do with horses and sheep, whose habitat is the short grass and the plain, but also trained and kept the cow that browses on the rich grass while she hides her calf in the thicket, the pig of the forest, and the goat of the hills, and the mention of corn requires their stay here and there to raise crops. But their use of metals, he tells us, had not advanced very far, the only word for metal common to many of the derivative languages being that which appears in Sanskrit as **ayas**, in Latin as *aes*, and in English as *ore*. The word at the time of the migrations from the main stock meant either copper or bronze. Their climate was temperate. Their lakes were open, but there was snow on lofty mountains near at hand.

The learned linguist accordingly gives his verdict as follows:

> The areas that will satisfy the linguistic data require a land with a temperate climate, remote from the sea and shut off from other areas, for otherwise it seems impossible that languages with so complicated a grammatical system as the Indo-European could have developed, bearing so close a resemblance to one another, and on the whole so strongly differentiated from other languages. The only area accordingly which will satisfy the conditions postulated is the great area in Europe which includes practically the former empire of Austria-Hungary.[1]

Next, as to their character, we may note only this: That they had a pretty name for themselves, based upon the adjective **arya**, which means 'faithful; attached, kindly,' the person whom you 'go eagerly to.'[2] We find it their name in changing form from east to west of the wide-stretching territory they eventually occupied in Euro-Asia. Thus *Airya* is their name in the Avesta, and so we may take it to be their name in the old Persian days. *Ārya* is their name in their ancient hymns, which we know as the Veda, composed by priestly families of the detachment that entered India and is still the name treasured in India by those who look back to the morning. *Erān* was the name of the present Persia in the Middle Persian language, and *Irān* is its name in Modern Persian. The great mountain with its summit capped with perpetual snow that bounds Irān's west is named *Ararat*. The region to the west of Ararat, where another contingent settled, is called *Armenia*. *Erin*[3] is the original name of the island still called *Ireland*, where yet another offshoot settled and which became the farthest Indo-European West, only because the boundless ocean stayed all further advance, until the fifteenth century, when Indo-European voyagers at last crossed the ocean, and let their brethren move further westward, not only that, but south and south-east as well, in the course of their travelling round the world to meet at last at Calcutta in the Āryans

[1] P. Giles, Art., "Indo-European Languages," p. 267, in *Encycl. Brit.*, [14].

[2] [L] the root being √ṛ, rise. Note in contrast the Latin *sēd-itio*, civil discord, from *sē* or *sēd*, inseparable preposition, denoting (i) separation or division, or (ii) reversal of the significance of the root +*itio*, going. [Dr. Smith's *Smaller Latin-English Dictionary* (New Edition).]

[3] *Eriu* is the nominative case; *Erinn*, the accusative [L].

of India, although they did not then know it, their long-lost linguistic brothers.

We say 'linguistic' brothers, because for us, who are studying the thought of those with whom we are concerned, language is the prime interest, but a glance at the physique of most of those who speak Indo-European tongues shows them to be, as one would expect, of the same racial stock.

What was the original Indo-European religion? So far as scholars can discover from the linguistic research just mentioned, the original Indo-Europeans had only one god, Dyaus, the Shining Sky.[1]

When we learn that there can thus be discovered only one God for them, and that God to be the Shining Sky, and recollect that it has been inferred that they spent their days on the apparently boundless Hungarian plain, the great open sky dominating their landscape, lofty mountains shutting them off from the rest of mankind, we wonder whether to these original Indo-Europeans there was not a revelation of the Majesty in Heaven granted, of a One God in contrast with whom other gods were of none or of little account, not very unlike that vouchsafed to the Hebrews, who were at a somewhat similar stage of civilisation with a similar vastness of sky over their boundless sand, and shut off similarly by their sands from the nations.

More particularly, we remember "the thunders and lightnings and the thick cloud" at Sinai, and the Lord "descending upon the mount in fire," and there speaking to Moses,[2] and that it was just under such awe-inspiring display in the heavens that this Dyaus, becoming Zeus and ruling gods and men from Olympus, impressed his authority upon the contingent that broke off from the original stock of Indo-Europeans and settled in Greece.

But we have to recognise that in the Veda, that is the collection we have of the hymns of the people whose religious thought we are about to study, who are a branch of the Indo-European contingent that came to be settled south and east of the Caspian Sea, Dyaus is of a very different status. In these hymns he is, as the sky is found to be among primitive peoples, simply the all-father, and has, as his spouse the earth, as all-mother.

[1] See VM.; also Keith in RVP. [2] Exod. xx. 16–19.

III. The Second Pre-Historic Period: The Attainment of the Airya Contingent.

Concerning the religion of the Indo-European contingent just mentioned, the Airyas, as we may call them, from the name given to them in the Avesta, who eventually settled south and east of the Caspian Sea, we get much more information from linguistic evidence than we get with regard to the religion of the original stock.

Among them we find, in ritual, 'sacrifice,' 'offerer (*hotṛ*),' the worship of fire, 'fire-priest,' 'established order' or 'rite' (ṛta[1] in the Rigveda, aṣa in the Avesta), and '*soma*,' this last the inspiring juice of a plant used as the main libation. With regard to the *soma*, we find its pressing mentioned, its purification by being passed through a sieve, its being mixed with milk, its growing on mountains which are high, for we find it described as brought down by an eagle or eagles,[2] just such mountains, we may add, as are the Caucasus and the Hindu Kush.

When we examine further what we have discovered to be the language of the Airyas we find, when we come to gods, not simply one god, as we found in the common language of the Indo-Europeans, but several gods, 'mighty kings, drawn by swift steeds through the air in war chariots, in character benevolent, and almost entirely free from guile and immoral traits'; a divinity who is a wise spirit (Sanskrit **asura**); a contest between a great god and a great demon; a ruler of the dead and of paradise;[3] and evil spirits as well.

IV. The Land of the Origin of the Veda.

Was there ever such a country as that which lies between the lofty snow-capped precipitous north-west corner of India and the salty Caspian Sea? Not because of the encroachment there of the arid loess, but because there so singularly poetry and religion have grown as one inflorescence. How rarely can we say of the hymn that it is a poem and that the poem is a hymn! but so it was there,

[1] See ṛta in Voc., p. 210, for its significance among the Āryans, the people with whom we have to do in this book, who withdrew from the Airyas and settled in India.

[2] VM., p. 7.

[3] VM.

both with the early reciters with whom we have to do in this book, and also with inhabitants who come later. Perhaps just because, with the struggle we have mentioned between the field and garden and the arid loess, heaven, on whose gifts from the sky and the hills the people were made thus so manifestly dependent, was the more in mind; and, on account of the constant alignment of the field and garden with the sand, each in its most vivid presentation, the beauty of earth the better appreciated.

Thus does this part of the world bestir Dr. Rickmer Rickmers in his book on *The Duab* ['*two rivers district*'] *of Turkestan*: "Men ask me to weld into beautiful symphonies of reality the two eternal elements of heaven and earth! Where is the golden mean that ever satisfies? Such may be the musings of one who lets his view sweep from the summits of Hazrat Sultan to Tamerlane's avenues."

The mention here of the avenues of Tamerlane is an allusion to Samarkand, which, we should notice, attracted an earlier conqueror than Tamerlane, for there, at the ancient city, Marakanda, now Afrosiab, close to the present city, Alexander the Great rested on his way to India. There it was, at a banquet, when both were heated with wine, that he slew his friend Kleitos, who had saved his life at the battle of the Granîcos six years before, being provoked at his friend's insolent language. He was inconsolable, we are told, at the death of his friend. At his departure he burned the city with fire.

Dr. Rickmer Rickmers then goes on to describe Samarkand:

> Where the mountains whence issues the Zarafshan river, overshadow the plain, there lies Samarkand, the queen of the world, like a lovely woman, reclining on her couch: she, who is the mother and child, in whom are conception and birth. To the mountains with their high serrated wall devoid of all vegetation, capped with snow, she is fulfilment and a promise, she the ever-youthful, beatific, crowned with the glory of Tamerlane. Seeing her, we feel that the towering giants of the south are a symbol of virility and the ardent plain of hopeful desire. Out of the passionate longing the creative power uplifts the miracle of growth and blossom, calling forth the young down of corn, the swelling bosom of the trees, and the ripening fruit.[1]

[1] See W. Rickmer Rickmers, *The Duab of Turkestan*, pp. 119, 120.

It was there, then, the Indian scholars Belvalkar and Ranade, from whose *History of Indian Philosophy* we shall have frequent occasion to quote, find from internal evidence that certain (therefore the earliest) hymns of the Rigveda, the collection of poetry of the Āryans, were composed, that is to say, to quote the definition of the professors, in 'the land beyond the Hindu Kush, to the west and north of it,' more particularly 'in North Irān, between the Caspian Sea and the Panjāb.'[1]

But that was only the earlier, the prehistoric, say somewhere in the second millenium B.C., spiritual blossoming of this land of green straths and oasis gardens and monotonous expanses of sand. In that land again, as we have said, this time at the beginning of the second millenium after our era, a composite upgrowth showed itself of what was at once poem and hymn; that is, not only after the Vedic poets of our story, but also after the Avestan sage Zārathustra, Greeks, Buddhists, and the people of Islām, had successively brought their influence to bear. Then it was, in ninth and tenth centuries, that poets arose at Samarkand, at Merv, at Bokhara, who presented for men's admiration 'real gems of spontaneous growth.'[2]

Through the next two centuries, the eleventh and twelfth, poets continue to appear, in Khorāsān, at Herat, and at Khiva. In the thirteenth century the greatest heights of the pantheistic 'Union with God' were attained, the richest flower of which showed itself in Jalāl-ud-dīn, who was born at Balkh, although his father, an orthodox Sunite, having incurred the wrath of the Sultan, who had become a Shī'ite, had to leave Balkh, while the future poet was still a child, and eventually settled at Iconium in Rūm (Asia Minor), where Jalāl-ud-dīn spent the last fifty years of his life, and whence he is known as Rūmī.[3]

One, as we have said, were these declaimers of the Veda and of Islām in their devotion to high heaven and in their linking therewith joy in the beauty of the round world below.

[1] CP. p. 10.

[2] Prof. V. F. Minorksy in "Persian Literature," p. 607, in *Encyl. Brit.*, [14].

[3] Prof. R. A. Nicholson in *Tales of Mystic Meaning* from **Jalāl-ud-dīn**, p. xv.

V. The New Inspiration.

So it was among the farthest east Airyas, that is to say, among those who dwelt just outside the north-west corner of India, that the Vedic inspiration, which is our present concern, the earlier of the two indigenous upgrowths we have noted, arose.

Already the Airyas of that day, as we have stated, practised fire-worship, believed in a Wise Spirit (Asura Mazda) and Eternal Order (ṛta) and in gods riding as kings through the sky in their chariots: and to that body of practice and belief those who received the new inspiration still held.

What then was the new element? Nothing less than the arrival of a new god, Varuṇa, in whom they saw, glorious in his palace in highest heaven, the Wise Spirit that people already believed to exist, and who maintained the Eternal Law, which was for them already an article of belief.

When we read of the description of Varuṇa in the poems we can understand how he so strongly moved these men's hearts.

Here is a summons to his praise:

> Sing a sublime prayer (**brahman**) to the ruler Varuṇa, the glorious, who, as a (sacrificial) slaughterer stretches a skin, has stretched out the earth to be a carpet for the sun.

And thus are his wonderful deeds recounted:

> Varuṇa spread abroad the air through the forests. He put speed into the horses, milk in cows, intellect in the heart, the Fire in the waters, the Sun in the sky, snow on the mountain.

And here is a personal confession:

> I will tell forth the great wondrous power of Varuṇa, the Asura-son. . . .
>
> None has dared to question this great wondrous power of the most wise God, in that the shining rivers with their water fill not the one sea into which they flow.[1]

Thus much of praise of ordering of nature. Here is Varuṇa's power in the realm of spirit made clear:

> What sin we have ever committed against an intimate, O Varuṇa, against a friend or companion at any time, a brother, a neighbour or a stranger, that, O Varuṇa, loose from us.

[1] RV. v. 85. 1, 2, 6; E. J. Thomas, *Vedic Hymns*, p. 56.

If we have cheated, as gamblers do at play, whether in truth or without knowing, all that loose from us, O God. So may we be dear to thee, O Varuṇa.[1]

Through weakness of understanding I have gone perversely, I know not how, O pure one. Be gracious, good ruler, show grace.[2]

What was the most grievous sin, O Varuṇa, that thou desirest to slay thy praiser, thy friend? Reveal it to me, thou hard to deceive, who preservest thine own nature. Quickly may I sinless[3] approach thee with reverence.[4]

O Varuṇa who preservest thine own nature, may this hymn of praise abide in thy heart.[5]

Every hymn to Varuṇa, Professor Macdonell tells us, contains a prayer for forgiveness of sin.

And notice this announcement of Varuṇa with regard to ṛta, the eternal order:

I uphold the heaven in the place of eternal order. And in accordance with eternal order I, the sacred son of Aditi, spread out the threefold world [heaven, atmosphere, earth].[6]

We are not, however, to think of Varuṇa as in isolation. We find with him, ruling in the same palace in heaven, an associate god, Mitra. Thus are the two addressed:

Guardians of ṛta, preserving true ordinances, ye mount the chariot in the highest firmament.

As sovereigns ye rule over this world, O Mitra and Varuṇa.[7]

One hymn[8] is offered to Mitra alone, in which he is thus described:

Mitra of wide renown, who surpasses heaven through his greatness, who surpasses earth through his glories. . . . Mitra bears up all the gods.[9]

How then did the Airyas of the new religion and those who still kept to the old get on together? Quite harmoniously at first. For those who joined the new faith

[1] RV. v. 85. 7, 8; *id.*, p. 57.

[2] RV. vii. 89. 3; *id.*, p. 58.

[3] sin, ēnas, n. [perhaps 'deed of violence,' from √in, drive; force (L)].

[4] RV. vii. 86. 4; *id.*, p. 58.

[5] RV. vii. 86. 8; *id.*, p. 59.

[6] RV. iv. 42. 4. This hymn is commented upon by Lanman, *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 367.

[7] RV. v. 63. E. J. Thomas, *Vedic Hymns*, p. 61.

[8] RV. iii. 59; *id.*, p. 60.

[9] RV. iii. 59. 7–8. *Id.* Bhandarkar conjectures that the name **asura** is preserved in the name of the country Assyria. See **asura** in *Voc.*

the old gods were still their gods, the old demons, their demons, the old ritual, their ritual; but at last tolerance on both sides ceased. We find, when we come to the later portion of the collection of hymns composed by the adherents of Varuṇa (the Rigveda) that the poets have come to understand **asura**, the name their fellow Airyas had for a god, to mean a devil, and the name they had for a devil to mean a god. The significance, in fact, of the religious vocabulary has become interchanged, the deities and devils of the one side becoming the devils and deities of the other. The strife this interchange indicates is believed to be embodied in the contests between gods and devils we find described in the Commentaries drawn up eventually with regard to the Vedic ritual.

Finally the obvious course was taken. The adherents of the new faith withdrew from those who still held to the old. From their North-East they trekked, through winding valleys and over mighty passes into the country that lay just beyond, to wit the wide plain of the Indus and its tributaries, and there, shut off from their troublers, settled down, ever, as the population increased, spreading still further away. We are following here the suggestion Professor Belvalkar deduces from the Poems and Commentaries as to what happened, and he explains thus, for one thing, the regard the Commentaries have for the North-East quarter as the direction of triumph and good auspices, and the fact that the Avesta, the book of the reformation by Zārathustra, among the original Airyas centuries afterwards, does not fail, presumably carrying down the old bitterness which had changed gods into demons, to put into that region Hell.[1]

VI. The Strength of the New Inspiration.

So there was strength in this new inspiration. Those who were moved by it call themselves **vipras**, a title usually translated 'poets,' which is a good translation, if we forget the etymology of the word 'poet.' True, every poet *is* a 'maker,' but first he is *made* to be a poet by what moves him, and it was this latter condition that was evident to these men, for **vipra** means 'agitated,' from √**vip**, 'tremble

[1] *Vedānta Philosophy*, Vol. I, p. 30.

or shake.'[1] The power that moved them they called **brahman.**[2] We may have noticed the word in the opening of the first hymn to Varuṇa, which we quoted, translated there by Dr. Thomas 'sublime prayer.' It means 'that which makes great or causes to swell,' and signified precisely for these reciters the energy that made their hearts 'swell' as they prayed to and praised their gods. Accordingly they called themselves Brahmins, the great title which their descendants still bear; that is 'men of the **brahman,**'[3] men moved by a heart-enlarging power that enabled them to pray. They believed that the gods also whom they addressed were moved by the **brahman,** and so were induced to grant to them their prayers; and that faith they were careful to instill into their patrons.

No wonder then that such believers in prayer had among their gods the god of prayer, Bṛhas-pati,[4] that is the Lord and Master of Prayer. He was the priest of the gods, and we find the poets in a passage of the Rigveda placing him in front of themselves as their head. He is a god peculiar to Vedic tradition, and regarded as of much importance, eleven hymns of the Rigveda being entirely allotted to his praise. Indeed Professor Macdonell conjectures that, being looked upon as the brahman-priest for the gods, he is the prototype of Brahmā, the chief of the Hindu triad of to-day.

His office it was to awaken the gods from their sleep by means of the sacrifice, and to recite before them when awakened the hymns in which they took pleasure. He himself composed hymns and passed them on to the priests among men. He is depicted seven-mouthed, seven-rayed, beautiful-tongued, golden-coloured and ruddy, having a

[1] √**vip**, be in trembling agitation; tremble *or* shake. Cf. Lat. *vibrare*, shake, brandish, from **vib-ru-s*,* *vip-ru-s*, shaking; Eng. *waver*; Eng. frequentative *whiffle*, veer about, blow in gusts; whiffle-tree, so called from its constant jerky motion (-tree means 'wooden bar') [L].

[2] Note that **a** in Sanskrit has the sound of the neutral vowel, the **u** in *but*, and that **h** is to be pronounced. See "Pronunciation of Sanskrit," p. 49; **bráhman** in Voc.

[3] Compare the Gaelic and Irish *bàrd*, singer. Oldenberg notes the Irish *bricht*, magic, incantation, and conjectures a connection of **brahman** therewith. [*Die Lehre der Upanishaden*, p. 46.]

[4] Professor Macdonell, seeing that the form **brahmanas-pati**, that is 'Lord and Master of the **brahman**,' is evidently an explanation of **bṛhas-pati**, concludes that the poets regarded **bṛh-as** as the genitive of a noun **bṛh**, from the same root **bṛh** as is **brahman**, VM., p. 103. See **bráhman** in Voc.

hundred wings and a clear voice, holding a bow the string of which is **ṛta**, the rite. The **ṛta** is also described as his car, and in it, as king of all prayers, he rides as do the rest of the gods in their cars in the sky, launching his arrows against those holding in enmity prayer and the gods.[1]

VII. The Exalted Character of the New Inspiration.

Here then is a poetry not only of strength, with which those who declaimed were **vipra**, 'shaking,' as are trees with the wind, but the breeze was a breeze from on high. They called themselves 'seers,' and what they recited is preserved by succeeding generations as **śruti**, 'a hearing,' from heaven, in distinction from that which is **smṛti**, 'remembrance' of the utterance of men. Rig-veda, the title given to the collection of their poems, means 'knowledge' (**veda**) expressed in verse (**ṛg**).

VIII. The Objective Fulness.

With regard to the subject-matter of their hymns we have to remember that we have generations of poets before us and the experiences of nature and man on the Caspian side as well as the Indian side of the Hindu Kush, and then across the wide Panjāb plain to just upon its eastern watershed.[2] We are to view the people spreading from the hills over that great Plain with its rich grass, its scattered trees, its mighty rivers, settling themselves down in their tribes, busy as herdsmen and husbandmen, not the only folk there, but finding a dark race settled before them with which they have many a conflict, also having conflict among their own tribes.

No wonder then that the poems are full of variety; so much to beseech the gods for, that the many needs and desires of life may be met—especially for a 'life of a hundred autumns,' 'sons who are heroes,' 'rich milk-giving kine'—and that the dark-skinned foes and kindred warring tribes may be overcome. Sometimes the great movements in nature, sometimes these battles, sometimes the common affairs of everyday life, absorb the poet's attention and acute observation is shown.

[1] See **bṛhas-pati** in VM., pp. 101–4.

[2] H. J. Eggeling, in article, "Sanskrit Language and Literature," revised by J. Allan, in *Encycl. Brit.*, [14].

The goddess of dawn is depicted in a manner that reminds one of Tennyson's portrayal of the homely beauty of the 'Gardener's Daughter,'[1] and you can almost hear in the poet's humorous lines the croaking of the frogs as they join together 'like the lowing of cows with calves,' one sidling up, 'like a son to a father,' as he talks.[2] The funeral is tenderly described, and the lonely plight of the widow.[3] The gambler's doings are related and he gets a good trouncing.[4]

IX. The Age of the Poets.

The reader will have already inferred that the way was not unbrokenly smooth for the poets. The religious strife we have mentioned, in which each side called the gods of their brethren demons, must have made the mind of the poets less peaceful than they liked. Yet there would be in that strife the satisfaction for each side that they felt themselves enlisted on behalf for what they deemed to be truly divine.

(i) *The Growing Preference for the God of Battle.*

But we have another trait in our Vedic poets, in which high matters of conscience seem to be rather deserted than maintained. We learn from Professor Macdonell that already in Rigvedic times Varuṇa, the great and wise Spirit, who dwelt in heaven, had a rival in the air beneath him, the god of the storm, Indra, who wielded with success the thunderbolt, and was therefore deemed to be the proper god to pray to for victory in battle. We find attributed to him universal authority as was assigned to Varuṇa. The professor points out indeed that the universal functions of the two were different: "When Indra is addressed as a universal monarch it is not as the applier of the eternal law of the inverse nor as a moral ruler, but as the irresistible warrior whose mighty arm wins victory and who also possesses as his distinctive trait inexhaustible liberality in the bestowal

[1] RV. i. 113. Trans. E. J. Thomas in *Vedic Hymns*. See also Maurice Bloomfield, *Religion of the Veda*, pp. 64–.

[2] RV. vii. 103. Trans. E. J. Thomas in *Vedic Hymns*.

[3] RV. x, 18. Trans. *id.*

[4] RV. x, 34. Trans. A. A. Macdonell in *Hymns from the Rigveda*.

of earthly goods."[1] *We are to notice, however, that the irresistibleness of Indra, whose great exploit on which the poets expatiate with much admiration, was the piercing of the huge sky-serpent of drought, was not so much inspired by a desire to rid the world of the evil, as by a rejoicing in simply the strength of his arm. Also, he was, as befits such a character, boisterous and rollicking, and, besides, so heavily did he drink Soma that he became a braggart of impossible deeds, and was—what is worse—on one occasion driven to murder his father. On these counts 'he falls,' our learned authority concludes, 'far beneath the general level of the high Vedic gods.'*[2]

Professor Lanman finds a gradual supersession of Varuṇa by Indra in a considerable number of passages. He quotes one in which first Varuṇa claims the supreme godhead and the godhead from the beginning, to which Indra responds by asserting his irresistible might as god of battle, and at last the hymn ends with an acknowledgement on the part of the poet of the superior claims of Indra.[3]

We can only plead our common frailty in the poet and his patrons when, seeing the foe before them, they realised the strong arm in the air that could, and most likely would, help them, if only for love of the fight, albeit above them in the heaven was Varuṇa, the only sure defender of a righteous cause.[4]

(ii) *The Increase in the Number of Officiants and the Rise of Hereditary Bodies with Special Functions.*

As the march of the successive generations of the poet-priests goes on we notice that the number of the officiants employed in the service increases.

At first, we infer, it was simply the poet himself, who, after making obeisance to the fire, poured into it the sacrificer's offering of milk, butter, grain or whatever it might be; for his name **hotṛ**, which, as we stated some time ago, dates back to Caspian days,[5] means properly 'offerer,' from the √**hu**, which means 'pour.'[6] But in the Rigveda Collection it is taken to be derived from the √**hū**, which means 'call,' and we find there already another priest, the **adhvaryu**,

[1] VM. [2] VM., pp. 64–66.
[3] L., p. 367. RV. iv. 42, of which L. gives the Sanskrit with notes.
[4] CP., p. 12. [5] P. 6. [6] L.

who does the manual acts of the sacrifice. The **hotṛ's** duty has become simply to *invoke* the gods.[1] So the Rigveda starts off with at least two priests, not one. Lists of seven and more afterwards appear,[2] some to assist the **adhvaryu** in the manual acts, others to sing the formulae. There come eventually to be three hereditary classes of priests employed at a service: the **hotṛ,** who intones the hymns; the **adhvaryu,** who mutters the formulae taken from them while he performs the manual acts; and the singer who sings formulae adapted to be sung. It is doubtful whether in Rigvedic times, but certainly afterwards, a fourth priest was appointed, as overseer of the whole sacrifice.[1] His duty it was to correct any mistake that might be made by any of the three priests just mentioned. This fourth priest was called the Brahmin in a special official sense, that is to say, as 'the man of the **brahman** (the prayer-force),' whose duty it was to see that throughout the ceremony no offence to that mysterious power should befall, a happening charged with calamity for those engaged in the sacrifice.

(iii) *A Deteriorating Influx.*

(*a*) *The Influx.*

And alas! it is not only a growing preference as time goes on for the God of Battles over Varuṇa that we have to deplore. Our two Indian scholars, Professors Belvalkar and Ranade, find a general deterioration of spiritual values set in even before the commencement of what they call the late Vedic period. They bid us observe how deeply it penetrated. It was brought about by the introduction of a "new and inferior pantheon," they tell us, that came to affect "the character of even the old Vedic gods and the mode and motive of their worship."[1] They recall in contrast the state of things in the really old Vedic days. "There was a primitive Vedic religion," they maintain, "wherein feeling was not overlaid, nor outraged, by form; a religion wherein joy in existence was not marred by a too frequent necessity to propitiate some malignant lesser spirits or to seek the intervention of an all-too-knowing and all-too-grabbing priesthood."[3]

[1] RPV., p. 254. [2] *Id.*, p. 252.
[3] CP., p. 8.

(*b*) *The Content of the Influx.*

Our two scholars describe the different content of the new sort of religion. The original Vedic poet-priest, they tell us, worshipped high nature-gods. Now they find "lesser divinities" invoked, "lesser" forsooth, unspeakably mean and malignant, and yet indeed "great" in the terror they inspire, and the dire evil they inflict upon the open or hidden foe whom they are induced to attack; also the weirdest witchcraft and the worship of animals and trees.[1] Most serious of all, the high gods, Professor Bloomfield tells us, are worshipped no longer with humble devotion, but are brought under compulsion.[1] "All that," our two Indian professors point out, is "quite different from the general mode and tone of the primitive days."

(*c*) *The Source of the Influx.*

The question then is, Whence was this change? Considering its radical nature, our two scholars maintain we have here a new sort of religion from that which was previously held, an example of the demonolatrous and grossly-magic stage of religion which anthropologists find to be usually passed through by mankind in the course of religious development. Professor Bloomfield as well reckons this new feature in the Vedic religion to belong to that stage, and our reader will feel how different it is from the worship by the Airyas of the bright sky-kings in their chariots. Yet we have evidence, which we give in our Vocabulary, from the Atharvāngirasas Collection of Spells, that even in the Airya days there was such a religion practised.[2] So, at least a certain amount of this deteriorate faith we may attribute to a yielding by the original Airyas to what was already in their midst, and may regard the strife that ultimately led to the withdrawal from among them of the people of the new god Varuṇa as a protest against that submission. But certainly most, and the most degraded, elements, of this demonolatry and witchcraft one would rather attribute, not to the Airya people at all, but to the dark-skinned race, presumably devotees of a lower sort of religion, among whom the adherents of Varuṇa, after they had passed through the mountains,

[1] CP., p. 16. [2] See *Atharvan* and *Angirases* in Voc.

had to settle. It is to be noted that it is only at the very end of the Rigvedic period, when the adherents of Varuṇa had spread across the whole breadth of the Panjāb, and there was consequently danger of their original enthusiasm dying down, that the Collection of demonolatrous magic we have noticed was published.

(iv) *Presentiments of Unity.*

There is a noble trait, however, that sets in after the procession of the Poets has gone some way. We find the idea that, while it is multiplicity that meets the eye as one looks upon the world, yet somehow what is present is One.

The thought makes its way in through two channels. First, in the poet's attributing to the god he is addressing, in order that the honour of the god may be the more increased, the attributes and acts of other gods. The reader may have already noticed this in the extracts we have given with regard to Varuṇa and Mitra; Mitra being lauded as bearing up all the gods just as Varuṇa has been lauded.[1] We shall presently find the same with regard to Varuṇa and Indra; Indra addressed as a universal monarch as it was the custom to address Varuṇa and to Indra the acts of Varuṇa ascribed.[2] Thus the outlines of the gods, their characteristics being so much shared by each other, become shadowy, and we arrive at the exclamation of a late hymn:

Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni, they style him.
He is also the Heavenly Bird, the winged Garutmān.
Being One, the poets many-wise name him
They call him Agni, Yama, or Mātari-śvan.[3]

Secondly, this conviction of the under-lying unity came also through contemplation of nature.

Agni [Fire] is One, only kindled in many places.
One is the Sun mightily overspreading the world.
One alone is the Dawn beaming over all this.
It is the One that has severally become all this.[4]

Yet we are not to think of this conviction as only based on deduction. Such a couplet as the following exhibits it as an intuition:

What moves and what moves not, all that the One rules;[5]
Also what walks and flies: all this multiform creation.[6]

[1] P. 10. [2] P. 35. [3] RV., i. 164, 46; CP., p. 23.
[4] RV. viii. 58, 2; CP., p. 23. [5] RV. iii. 54, 8; CP., p. 23.
[6] See CP., p. 23.

It is interesting to notice in what different aspects even in these three examples the One appears. Where we see one god receiving the attributes of the rest we have the apprehension of a Personality, and the phrase 'the One ruler' gives us a Personality outside creation and controlling it. On the other hand, the statement 'the One has become all this' bespeaks an impersonal and an inclusive entity, not an entity apart.

Indeed—to mention only one point—we seem to meet here after all an inkling of the presence not of One but of Two: One Person coming forward as the One spiritual power, the other persons being for the moment out of mind, and also a Neuter One, apprehended as the poet looks on the world: briefly, a dualism not a monism.

(v) *The Elevation of the Sacrifice.*

Another noble mode of thought! We find in a late poem,[1] noted for its length and lofty imagination, the sacrifice regarded as a replica of what goes on in heaven.

The fire into which the priests on earth pour their offerings is in that poem held to be brother to the heavenly fire that shines in the sun and stars and to the fire that plays in the air as the lightning; and the seven priests round the earthly fire to correspond to seven priests in the firmament.[2] In certain verses the heavenly priest is regarded as guardian and inspirer of the poet who recites below.[3] The hearth of the sacrifice is declared to extend to the extreme limit of the earth and the sacrifice itself to be the navel of all existence, while the priest as he pronounces the sacred utterance (**brahman**) is declared to be the highest firmament of speech,[4] and the utterance itself the roar of the mighty ox of heaven.[5]

But this conception loses, we will surely agree, its grandeur and truth when we find that not simply the sacrifice as a whole, but, Belvalkar and Ranade inform us, "the several

[1] RV. i. 164, already quoted on p. 3.

[2] RV. i. 164, 1–3. See D.I., i, p. 108.

[3] RV. i. 164, 37–39. D.I., i, p. 116.

[4] RV. i. 164, 35. Atharva-veda, 9.10.14. (Whitney.)

[5] RV. i. 164, 40–42, D.I, i, p. 117. Note the likening of the world to an Ox in Selection 2 (BAU. i, 2), p. 58, and Selection 7 (CU. 4, 4–9), p. 91.

stages of the ritual—its preliminary rites and ceremonies, the consecration ceremony, the fasts, the baths, and even the place and the period of worship, the number of priests and of potsherds, the sacrificial cakes (made of rice)—come all to be invested with cosmic significance."[1]

X. The Age of the Omnipotence of the Magic and Acquisitive Ritual.

(i) *The Arrival at the Strait of Fertile Land before the Watershed between West and East was arrived at.*

How then at this late period of our story are the Āryans situated? They have come to be spread, as we have already mentioned, far from the hills they passed through when they parted from the Airyas. They stretch now right across the plain of the Panjāb. Their advance settlements are on the extreme east thereof, on the doāb (two-waters district), of the two rivers now known as the Sarsuti and Chautang.[2]

Here the advancing tribes have come to what Professor Rapson describes as the 'narrow strait of habitable land which lies between the desert and the mountains.'[3] This strait abuts on the watershed that divides the plain of the Indus from the plain of the Jumna and Ganges.

(ii) *The Change in the People themselves who arrive there.*

But it is not the narrowing of the fertile land in which the people may disperse that need claim our attention. What is of moment for us is the change observed in the people themselves that arrive there. It is a 'marked change'; there is no 'shading by degrees,' Professor Rapson tells us. The change occurs about the longitude of Sirhind, which strikes through the doāb we have mentioned. At once we are aware that the people are no longer Āryan in language but Āryo-Dravidian. That evidently means that they have come upon a Dravidian people that have an influence upon them that the earlier inhabitants among whom the tribes left behind had settled had not. Not only does their ancient

[1] CP., p. 17.
[2] A. A. Macdonell, *Imperial Gazetteer of India*,[1] Vol. II, p. 227.
[3] *Cambridge History of India*, I, p. 46.

literature testify to this change, but to-day we find that the people on the east of the longitude we have mentioned are different in physique from those on the west. That the change should be so radical implies that the incoming Āryans have now met with a people possessing a culture largely akin to their own.

Also, we find with these Āryo-Dravidians as they continue the onward movement of the Āryans that the waves of migration have been "impeded at this point," that "the influence farther east of this incoming people must be due rather to penetration, warlike or peaceful, than to the wholesale encroachment of multitudes."[1]

(iii) *The Cessation of the Poetry.*

Most striking feature of the change, however, for us who are studying the deeper mind of these people, is that the poetry now ceases. The doāb of the Sarsuti and Chautang proved to be the Land of the Swan-song. There the last hymns were sung. Fitly that doāb was ever after remembered as **Brahmāvarta**, the land of the brahman, the prayer-force, the Spirit.

(iv) *The Formation of the Rigveda.*

When the advancing tribes have got beyond the doāb of the Sarsuti and the Chautang, and have come to colonise the country immediately over the watershed where the upper waters of the Jumna and the Ganges flow, the leaders of thought among the Men of the Spirit retain indeed their ancient name of ṛṣi (seer), but they compose no poetry. What they do is to make, with the service of the altar for by far the most part in view, a Collection of the poetry their predecessors have composed, giving it the name we have noted, Rig-veda, 'knowledge expressed in verses.'

(v) *Two New Vedas.*

Also, after a while those among the seers that belong to the Adhvaryu class, the class we noted that was engaged with the manual acts of the sacrifice, draw up a Veda for the Adhvaryus, made up of formulae in prose and verse drawn for the greater part from the Rigveda, that were

[1] Professor Rapson in *Cambridge History of India*, I, p. 45.

muttered by the Adhvaryu as he performed his manual acts. This they called the Yajur (worship) Veda. The leaders among the Singing Priests also put up a Veda for the Singers, made up of formulae from the Rigveda modified to suit certain tunes. They named it the Sāma (Tune)-Veda.

Thus there came to be Three Vedas, and they were known as the Threefold Knowledge (Trayī-vidyā).

(vi) *The Forming of the Commentaries.*

But these seers not only drew up the Threefold Knowledge. They also began to compose Commentaries (**brāhmaṇas**), that should give not only 'descriptions of the sacrificial ceremonies,' but also 'attributions of hidden meanings, accounts of their origin, and legends to illustrate their efficacy.'[1]

(vii) *The Region of this Compilation of the Hymns and Commencement of Commentaries on the Ritual.*

The region of this activity of leaders among the priests Professor Rapson defines as "the upper portion of the doāb between the Jumna and the Ganges and the Muttra district of the United Provinces."[2] These leaders and this activity of theirs in mind, this doāb came to be called "the Land of the Seers among the Men of the Spirit" (**brahmarṣi-deśa**).

(viii) *The Expansion of the Commentaries.*

Still the people advance. Beyond the upper portion of the doāb between the Jumna and Ganges they proceed further east. The portion of the people who have thus advanced are the Kuru-Pancālas, and among them the men of the spirit are now busy enlarging the commentaries they have begun upon the ritual, for the dominant feature of the age we have now entered upon is belief in the all-mighty all-reaching power of the word and act at the altar.

So may this age be called not only the Age of the Magic Ritual but the Age of the Commentaries, and this country of the Kuru-Pancālas the Land of the Commentaries.

[1] Lanman's *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 357.

[2] *Cambridge History of India*, I, p. 46.

(ix) *The Change of Character in the Mind of the Priest and of the Significance of the Ritual.*

From of old, as we have seen, the priests believed indeed in the power of the hymns and praises they solemnly intoned as poets at the altar, but now quite a new significance comes to these now reduced to mere formulae, and a new power to the priest who has become an enchanter. Professor Maurice Bloomfield thus writes:

> The Yajur-veda presents the exceeding growth of ritualism and sacerdotalism as time went on. We notice that the main object of the ceremony, namely, the worship of the gods, is lost sight of. Solemn, pompous, performance, garnished with lip service, now occupies the stage. The performance is supposed to have a magic or mystic power of its own, so that every detail of it is all-important. Mechanically, by its own intrinsic power, it regulates the relation of man to the divine powers. Yet is that power controlled and guided by the wonderful technique of the priests and their still more wonderful insight into the meaning of the technical acts.

He continues:

> A crowd of priests we see—seventeen is the largest number—conduct an interminable ceremonial, full of symbolic meaning down to its smallest minutiae. The priests seat themselves on the sacrificial ground strewn with blades of sacred **darbha**-grass and mark out the altar-hearths on which the sacred fires are then built. They arrange and handle the utensils and sacrificial substances. Then they proceed to give to the gods of the sacrifice, to each god his proper oblation and his proper share. The least and most trivial act has its stanza or formula. Every utensil has its own particular blessing pronounced upon it.
>
> It is these stanzas and formulae with a description of the proper rite more or less directly attached to them, that make up the numerous redactions of the Yajur-veda, the Veda of Sacrifice.[1]

We are to note, however, to the credit of these priests, that they did not take their formulae from the Veda of the Spells. They declared that such a gross magic was 'devilish.' Our two Indian scholars bid us beware indeed of making too much of this distinction. They say the mode of mind and act between those who used the Rigvedic formulae and those who used the formulae of the

[1] M. Bloomfield, *Religion of the Veda*, p. 31.

Veda of the Spells was rather a difference between 'my-doxy' and 'thy-doxy' than a difference of essential quality. Yet the Collection of gross magic was not, at all events for a long period, officially used. A striking testimony to that is that in South India into which the Men of the Spirit later on carried their teaching and practice and where now they are so peculiarly dominant with their great temples and elaborate worship, the Atharva-Veda is to-day 'practically unknown.'[1] Yet one would judge that after all it did eventually get in the north country, the homeland of these priests, a place in the customary ritual, seeing that not only is it announced immediately after the three Vedas, which head the long list of sacred works that is repeated in the Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest[2] and in the Maitri[3], but still remains in that position in the Chāndogya[4] and Taittirīya[5] Upanishads in which no other sacred works are mentioned, ranking there accordingly as fourth in a conjoint four; but also among the Thirteen Principal Upanishads has three Upanishads of its own, the Muṇḍaka, the Praśna, and the Māndukya.

(x) *The Power of the Sacrifice in the World.*

Thus Professor Belvalkar describes the condition of things:

> Every single detail of the Sacrifice was believed to be full of untold potentialities for good or for evil according as it was well or ill performed. In fact, all the happenings of the universe—the sun, rain, and harvest: births, deaths, pestilences; the course of the planets in their orbits, the success and stability of kingdoms, the peace and prosperity of the people—were believed to be the direct result of this or that feature of the sacrifice. The gods, even the highest of them, Prajā-pati, the Lord of Creatures, the Creator of the World, derived their godhood from the sacrifice. The world-creation was a process of sacrifice and its indispensible preliminary, self-castigation, and it was the continuance of that process of sacrifice which sustained the world[6]—

[1] Art. in "Sanskrit Literature," in *Encycl. Brit.*, [14].

[2] BAU., 2.4.10=4.5.11 (p. 134); 4.1.2.

[3] Maitri, 6. 32,33.

[4] CU., 3.1-11.

[5] TU., 2. 3 (p. 80).

[6] Note numbers 1 and 2 of the Selections (BAU. i. 1 and 2), where the World-process is the Sacrifice of the Creator to Himself, but the earthly sacrifice has become no longer causal, but representative, of that fact.

provided indeed that the sacrifice was performed correctly to the smallest detail of the ritual prescribed. Consequently there was believed to be in the knowledge of the minutiae of the sacrifice not only the salvation of the sacrificing patron and his household, but of the whole universe.[1]

It was accordingly believed that every single object in the world was in bond with a part or aspect of the sacrifice, and consequently with every other object in the world that came under this bond. The world, in fact, was a net-work of invisible potential lines of force on which certain series of objects were strung, all of which proceeded from the sacrifice, and which the sacrificing priest could by the ritual make active.[2]

(xi) *The Decline of the Gods.*

Of a bond or line of force the authority just quoted gives the following example. In the age we are now in, the age of the dominance of the ritual as interpreted by the commentaries, Indra had come to be the chief god. Not only had he acquired complete superiority over Varuṇa, but Prajā-pati, the Lord of Creation, who was then nominally the supreme god, was, Professor Belvalkar tells us, "a nebulous and semi-ritualistic figure, 'an apex [and here he quotes with approval the description by Oldenberg] set up by the priesthood to the pantheon as it now existed in this age, an unsteady apex moving to and from with each breeze of fantasy and each caprice of these thinkers.' "[3] With such a shadowy, variously conceived, figure in high heaven, albeit of the Creator and Sustainer of all, the Prince of power in the air, the mighty Indra, immediately over the head of the priest, a divinity strong in his deeds, already, as we saw, regarded during the age of the poets as the god rather to be appealed to for success in this world than the spiritually superior Varuṇa, became the god supreme over all for all practical purposes. Now it is to be noted that the number sacred to Prajā-pati was seventeen, while that to Indra was eleven. The reason why eleven was so dedicated was because each quarter of the metre of the sentences wherewith Indra was invoked contained eleven syllables. Accordingly everything to which the number eleven could be

[1] S. K. Belvalkar, *Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy*, Part i, p. 33.

[2] *Id.*, p. 34.

[3] *Id.*, p. 48. The quotation from Oldenberg is from p. 32 of his *Weltanschauung der Brāhmana-texte*.

applied was united to him. Indra's mighty power passed through the number eleven. The number eleven came in fact to be identified with Indra himself. A far-reaching influence therefore was his who dealt at the altar with that number. He had under his control none less than the god who wielded universal power in the world below.[1]

We can easily imagine what a strange sort of universe this web woven of lines of force, all springing from the altar, must have been for those men. They wearied themselves, puzzling over this conception, working out the series of objects that could be linked together, like beads, along these magic lines: 'magic,' indeed, for by means of these threads that brought certain objects in touch with each other, these officiants compelled the gods to act, and mechanical compulsion of the gods is, of course, the essence of magic.

(xii) *Summary of the Change in Religion.*

So then, the religious thought of the Āryans had certainly changed. From looking up, as the poets had looked up, to the sky and on nature around and glorying in a humble spirit over the aspects and works of the gods, these men had lowered their eyes and fixed their attention upon the sacrifice and their official dealings therewith, and then looked up and around, and lo! the heavens for them were vacant of authority. They had come to believe with a passionate devotion that it was their own ritual acts and their own repetitions of sentences of the Veda that were the real controllers of the gods. Their all-consuming anxiety was now to discover the connexions of things with the sacrifice. The gods had become little more than potences. The conception of the world was little more than that of a network of blind lines of force, all starting from the sacrifice and played upon at their own will by their incantations.[2]

(xiii) *The Decline of Philosophy.*

As for the idea of the Unity of all-being which had come up, as we have observed, in the presentiments of the Poets,

[1] Belvalkar. Work cited, Part i, p. 34.

[2] The confusion of mind is well described by Oldenberg in his *Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa-texte.*

it was "in this Age of the Dominance of the Sacrifice in a state of ebb," says Professor Oldenberg; "the circle of thoughts which had its centre in the Offering obscured it." "True," he goes on to say, "it was understood as self-evident that the world must have grown out of one root, and before the fancy there appeared such root-existences as 'being' and 'not-being,' but in the actual world the One thus conceived played no part. The universe before the mind was simply the justing-ground of numberless single-existences whose movements mostly had no common rhythm and no all-binding goal, and, if the fancy raised one or other of these for a moment to the highest place and equated it with 'all This [Being],' it was only by a chance among other chances. These fancies, perhaps indeed, helped to prepare for the idea of the All-One which was to be taken up so strongly in the succeeding period of the Upanishads. But, to speak seriously, there was no effort of thought that got so far down into Being's true depth."[1]

XI. The Escape in the Upanishads from the Magic and Acquisitive Ritual to the Glory of the Self, the Spirit: Seven Steps.

It would be astonishing that there should not be endeavours to escape from the weight of ritual and degrading conception of religion we have described. It was, however, only with the Upanishads—the teaching of the Secret Lore of which we present specimens in this book—that the escape really began.

True, there were preparatory ideas before that. Belvalkar and Ranade tell us: "It can be safely asserted that amongst the new ideas occurring in the Upanishads there is hardly one that is not implicit in, and logically deducible from, the ideas present in different portions of the Commentaries on the Ritual."[2] As to the character of the thinking, however, we have just learned from Oldenberg's description, that, with all its variety, it lacked serious determination to get to the depth of things.

So it is with the Upanishads we find the path of escape really begun and we seem to count along it Seven Steps.

[1] H. Oldenberg, *Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa-texte*, p. 243-.
[2] CP., p. 84.

(i) *The First Step of Escape: The Actual takes the Place of the Symbol.*

The first step was enabled by a literal step-out. The wearied ritualist looked round upon the busy transactions at the altar with the accompanying incantations and the rich gifts, and realised at last that in these very things he had taken part in and had gloried in were the means of his depression. He fled. He made his way to the forest. Behind him were his company of fellow-priests, the sacrifice with its labours, its splendour, and its gifts. He remained in the quiet, thinking over it all. There must be a meaning, he felt, in it all, and he was determined to find it. Not that he kept entirely out of touch with the sacrifice. Indeed we find attributed to notables of these forest dwellers elaboration of sacrifice and altar. Students of the sacrifice repaired to them for instruction, and their own caste of sacrificing priests came to them as pupils and were received as such. Nor were they exclusively in the forest. We read of a great disputation of clergy in which a notable hermit[1] took a leading part, which was a disputation arranged by a king to take place at a great sacrifice he held for the purpose at his court.[2] Yet henceforth their proper dwelling-place was in the retirement of the forest and their life a life of meditation withdrawn from ceremonies.

The results of these earliest meditations, which we count as the First Step of those who escaped, are handed down in the treatises called Āraṇyakas, that is 'belonging to the forest,' **araṇa**,[3] because, we may conjecture, in the forest they were thought out. Not only, however, in the treatises so named do we find the outcome of these meditations recorded.

It is one of the Upanishads that the first of the two typical illustrations of this mode of thought that are given to us by Belvalkar and Ranade is contained. It is as follows: "When a man [who is a sacrificer] hungers, thirsts and abstains from pleasures, that is the Initiatory Rite. Penance, liberality, righteousness, truthfulness, these are the Gifts to the Priests."[4]

[1] Yājnavalkya. [2] BAU. 3.

[3] **áraṇya**, wilderness, forest ['strange land' from **araṇa**, distant, strange]. [L.]

[4] CU. 3. 17. 1. CP., p. 85.

The second typical illustration these two authorities give us is likewise drawn from another class of treatises, the Śāstras,[1] *which are Compendiums of various sorts of* Instruction. "A wise man, if he perform a mental sacrifice at which meditation is the fire; truthfulness the fuel; patience the oblation; modesty the sacrificial spoon; abstention from injuring life the sacrificial cake; contentment the sacrificial post; and [a promise of] safety to all beings which is hard to keep, the reward that is given to the priests, goes to heaven."[2]

Here we see that, in contrast to the material sacrifice, it is a mental sacrifice, a cost to a man's will and heart,[3] that wins heaven. The self is brought forward here and its discipline is distinguished from the mere offering of material gifts and of rigorous treatment of the body, which alone the material sacrifice ostensibly required, whatever else might be implied.

We will notice that in this mode of thought the thing signified has taken the place of the sign. The fire is left behind; we have meditation instead, which the fire is taken to represent. The sacrificial cake is no longer before us, but abstention from injuring life. That is to say, it is the thing supposed to be signified that occupies the hermit's concern, and not that which merely represents it.

We have already noted that in the Commentaries on the Ritual certain portions of the world came to be regarded as manifestations of certain stages or items of the sacrifice.[4] We find similarly the Upanishad called the 'Secret Teaching in the Chant'[5] lead off with Lists of natural phenomena that correspond to stages of the Loud Chant (the Ud-gītha), the Chant to which the title of that Upanishad refers.

Thus we are told that in the following ascending phenomena we should reverence these successive transactions of the Chant.

[1] Ś = sh. See *Pronunciation of Sanskrit*, p. 49.

[2] **Vasishṭha Dharma-śāstra**, 3. 8. CP., p. 85.

[3] It is to be noted that in Vedic psychology the mind (**manas**) is regarded as situated in the heart and includes emotion, mind and will. See manas in Voc.

[4] P. 24.

[5] The Chāndogya Upanishad.

The earth is the Preliminary Vocalizing.
Fire is the Introductory Praise.
The atmosphere is the Loud Chant.
The sun is the Response.
The sky is the Conclusion.[1]

We have a much-worked-out example of transition from *sign to thing signified* in our First and Second Selections, but there it is not any particular movement or object in the world that the sacrifice is found to signify, but the world as a whole. The Horse Sacrifice is brought before us and *is declared to be in its translation into the actual the universe, conceived as one stupendous holocaust.*

(ii) *The Second Step: The Two Inheritances brought forward.*

We have recorded Professors Belvalkar and Ranade telling us that the ideas in the Commentaries on the Ritual were utilised by the Upanishad philosophers.

The transference we have noted from the symbol to what the symbol was believed to really mean having begun, the next step was to bring forward into special prominence two of the old items: the Prayer-force (the **brahman**) and the World-person (the **puruṣa**).

(*a*) *The Prayer-force.*

We have already mentioned the Prayer-force, the **brâhman** as it was called, because it made the heart to swell, but we have not made as clear as we might how essentially it was a force and a World-force.

This, which we would call the non-spiritual phase of the Prayer-force, is brought before us in the second and third sections of the Kena Upanishad.

The brahman is there called a **yakṣa,**[2] a sprite. We are told that the gods themselves did not understand it. It had won a victory for them, and they had not acknowledged that by it they had become victorious. So it appeared

[1] CU., 2. 2. [H.].

[2] **Yakṣá,** *n.*, spirit *or* sprite *or* ghost; *as m.* a Yaksha, one of a class of fabulous genii [perhaps 'a restless one,' from the √**yakṣ,** stir, move quickly, *and so, on the one hand,* pursue, *esp.* pursue avengingly, avenge; *and, on the other,* dart swiftly (as a suddenly appearing light). For connection of meanings of root and derivations compare the converse relation of Eng. *spirit* or *sprite* to *sprightly,* 'brisk, stirring,' and compare Scott's 'restless sprite.' [L.]

before them; and, when they caught sight of it, their want of understanding came home to them. They accordingly deputed Fire to discover what it might be. Fire went up to the sprite and claimed to burn everything; but when the sprite put a straw before him and challenged him to burn it, he could not burn it. Next they sent Wind. On his declaring that he could carry everything off, the sprite put before him in like manner a straw and challenged him also to put forth his power, but, going at the straw with all speed, Wind could not carry it off. Then the gods sent Indra. However, when Indra went up to it, the sprite, strange to say, did not challenge him but vanished. "In that very space,"[1] we are told, Indra came upon a woman exceedingly beautiful, Umā, daughter of the Snowy Mountain (**Himavat**), and he inquired of her, "What is this wonderful being (**yakṣa**)?" "It is brahman," she said. "In that victory of brahman, verily, exult ye." Thereupon he knew it was brahman. It was because Indra was thus the first of the gods to know it was brahman, the story finishes by telling us, that Indra became their chief.

We have to remember, however (and the manner in which Indra in the story we have just related comes to the knowledge of it gives us a hint of its spiritual quality), that all the time this strange uncanny quasi-material force was the energy in the hymns that made the heart of the poet expand as he recited them, the energy in the spell that the enchanter muttered.

Accordingly we see a double-character in the brahman. It is at one time a force mechanically acting without, at another time an inspiration moving within. It was an age in which analysis had not gone far. The spiritual and the material, the moral and the non-moral, the cosmic and the personal, were not as yet clearly distinguished.

(*b*) *The World-Person, the Puruṣa.*

The other item that was brought forward was the World-person, the Puruṣa.

Puruṣa means simply a man.[2] Each individual is a man, but the puruṣa that most dominated in the early mind, the puruṣa that was always present, was the World-puruṣa, the

[1] 'Where the Yakṣa stood' is the explanation in B. D. Basu's *Sacred Books of the Hindus.*

[2] See **puruṣa** in Voc.

World-man. In early human thought and practice the individual man counted but little. In fact history, we realise, may be defined as the process of the individual coming to his own. And the process is not yet over. In early practice the tribe ruled the man, but supreme above all was the World-man. His head was the sky, his eye was the sun, the quarters of heaven were his ears, the earth was his feet, the wind was his breath, and so on. We find also, evidently, since it is particular, a later conception, and arising of course only among those who had to do with cattle, the conception of the world as a Bull. In the course of our Second Selection this idea is introduced. The world is depicted as an Ox that is standing firm in the waters, the east his head, the west his tail, the sky his back, the atmosphere his belly, the earth his chest.[1] The same idea underlies the story in Selection 7, where the Bull, describing the world, speaks of the four quarters of the world as four feet or limbs; the quarters no doubt of his own world reality. In our First Selection, however, we find the world described as a horse, the sun his eye, the wind his breath, the sky his back, the seasons his limbs, his yawning the lightning, his shaking himself the thunder; but that is for the special reason that the teacher may identify the world with the horse sacrifice.

(iii) *The Third Step: The Actualising of the Prayer-force.*

We have seen how confused was the idea of the Prayer-force. Two things, however, about it were clear. It was the power that was in the hymns the poet recited and in the formulae which, drawn from these hymns, the enchanter muttered. Also, it had a mighty influence in the world; so great, that the very gods won victories by it.

Yet it was an uncanny, quasi-personal thing, as we have seen, that could behave very perversely with those that did not recognise it for what it really was. Yes, what was it? It took an Indra to be reckoned by it as having a suspicion of what it was and to have his suspicion confirmed and become knowledge by the information given to him by Umā.

[1] P. 58.

(*a*) *The Actualising of the Prayer-force in the World.*

The power of this force that moved in the hymns is proclaimed in the Hundred-Paths Commentary on the Ritual, the largest of all the Commentaries, believed to have been published in full form well on in the Upanishad period, indeed only shortly before the doctrines of the Buddha were put into shape.

There we find that the Creator uses this mysterious force for the making of the world. First by it he creates the verses, the Rig—Yajur—and Sāma-vedas, that is the Threefold Knowledge. Then he uses that Threefold Knowledge as a support on which to sit, while, by practising ascetic discipline, he produces from himself the world.[1]

In another section of the same Commentary, the Creator is left out altogether. We are told that all that exists was originally simply the Prayer-force, and that the Prayer-force produced from itself the three great gods, Fire, Wind and Sun, and set each of them in his proper place of earth, atmosphere, and sky.[2]

With that creative activity ascribed to the force that moved in the hymns and made the priest's heart to swell as he uttered them, we can understand the Lists in the Secret Teaching of the Chant, of which we have already given an example[3] which set in detail objects and movements in the world that are the expressions of specified parts of the priest's incantation. Here follows from the same series another List which prescribes how one should in a rain-storm worship the Loud Chant.

> The preceding wind is a Preliminary Vocalizing.
> A cloud is formed: That is the Introductory Praise.
> It rains: That is the Loud Chant.
> It lightens, it thunders: That is the Response.
> It lifts: That is the Conclusion.[4]

We shall notice how the gods have here disappeared and that there is no chain of correspondences between the reciter and the actual world.

So we are prepared for such a conception as we find in our Selection 7, to which we have lately alluded,[5] in which

[1] **Śata-patha Brāhmaṇa**, 6.1.8ff., quoted in CP., p. 68.
[2] *Id.*, 11.2.3.1.ff. CP., p. 68.
[3] CU. 2.2., on p. 30.
[4] CU. 2.3. [H].
[5] P. 32.

the Bull described the four quarters or limbs of the World-Bull. A student of the Prayer-force is there depicted, sent by his teacher into the wilderness to tend his preceptor's cows. Thus employed in obedience to his teacher, he is at the same time deprived of the instruction he longs to receive. On his departure he had volunteered to his teacher that he would not return until the herd had reached a thousand. When it has so increased, the Bull takes pity upon him, and tells him that a certain quarter of the world is really a quarter of the Prayer-force, and tells him what is the name of the quarter. Then successively the Fire the student has kindled for the night, the Swan, and the Diver-bird, disclose the names of the other three quarters. Here we find the Prayer-force not only independent of the gods but of the magician. The world, including, we should notice, not only the world outside man, but his own body, breath, eye, ear, and mind, is presented, apart from any connection with the altar, an embodiment in itself of the Prayer-force, the Spirit.

In its most general terms this conception is expressed as the beginning of Śāṇḍilya's Creed:[1] "Verily this whole world is the brahman."

(*b*) *The Actualising of the Prayer-force in Man.*

So much for the Prayer-force in the World. What now with regard to the Prayer-force in man?

One would have thought that the mere fact that it was the power that produced the hymns would have made it sufficiently human. But we have to remember the strong objectifying of early thought. We have seen that the hymns themselves were supposed to be heard (**śruti**) in heaven, and that this brahman was conceived as a world-force quasi-personal that embodied itself in the hymns and by that means expanded the poet's heart.[2]

[1] P. 87.

[2] This conception of the power that stirred to prayer as a power semi-personal independent of man is well paralleled by the conception of Wisdom in the Graeco-Judaic *Wisdom of Solomon*, as estimated by Lascelles Abercrombie. We have to notice, however, how ennobled beyond the range of the Forest Fathers' apprehension of such matters, the Jewish conception is through the introduction therein of the revelation of God that the Jews had received. Lascelles Abercrombie thus writes: "In the *Wisdom of Solomon* wisdom is no perfection of the intellectual man; it is no sort of exercise of human nature at all. It is an energy pouring into the world from beyond it, vivifying it and disposing it: 'more moving than any motion.' When it visits the mind of man, it

The actualising of the Prayer-force in the World which we have seen made known to the student of religion in the wilderness was so far an actualising of it in man: for man's faculties were part of the world. The breath, the eye, the ear, the mind, we saw, were declared to the student to be a quarter of brahman. But these comprise a much larger territory of human nature than the region (the heart) in which the Prayer-force properly flows.

Coming nearer, however, to a presentation of its true relation to man is the place the brahman occupies in the Taittirīya Upanishad. There the brahman is the support, the limbs, on which stands the Man who is composed of Bliss.[1]

More satisfactory still is the presentation of the Prayer-force in Śāṇḍilya's Creed: "This Self of mine within the heart, smaller than the kernel of a grain of millet, greater than these worlds. This is the brahman."

(iv) *The Fourth Step: The Actualising of the World-Person.*

Let us next consider the actualising of the World-Person.

We have already seen him conceived as the World as a whole, the sky his head; the sun his eye; the quarters of the heaven his ears; the earth his feet.

Next we see him more human. He is the person seated in the sun.

But there was also the Person in the eye, which one sees step forward and look out when one looks into a neighbour's eye. We will remember the name 'pupil' we have taken from the Latin, with both the meanings 'little boy' and 'pupil in the eye' in both Latin and English.

is not merely government there, but the bestowal of knowledge of itself, as 'the breath of the power of God, the brightness of the everlasting light.' Wisdom is sometimes the name for the spirit of divine activity, sometimes for a man's sense of this; and often the two meanings combine. When he is speaking of Wisdom as the executant of God's will, the poet can summon up a picture as direct as anything in Homer:

> 'For, while all things were in quiet silence, and that night was in the midst of her swift course, thine Almighty word leaped down from heaven out of thy royal throne, as a fierce man of war into the midst of a land of destruction, and brought thine unfeigned commandment as a sharp sword, and standing up filled all things with death; and it touched the heavens but it stood upon the earth.' *Wisdom*, 18. 14–16."
>
> [Lascelles Abercrombie, *The Idea of Great Poetry*, p. 121.]

[1] Selection 3, p. 82 (TU. 2. 5.).

So there came to be two Persons to be recognised: That in the sun and That in the eye.

The next aspect is that observed by Śāṇḍilya, who at first unites, or seems to unite, the two Persons, speaking in his Creed of 'the Person encompassing this whole world,' and then, forthwith, of 'this Self of mine within the heart, greater than the earth, than the worlds'; and yet concludes with 'Into him I shall enter on departing hence,' thus still maintaining the duality.

The next stage is that presented in Selection 3 from the Taittirīya Upanishad, in which the exalted Self comes down to embody himself as the person of man and after a while returns to his high seat above.

(v) *The Fifth Step: The Thorough De-objectifying of the Prayer-force and the Person.*

The Fifth Step on the path of escape from the magic ritual seems to present itself as the de-objectifying of the Prayer-force and the Person.

(*a*) *The De-objectifying of the Prayer-force.*

We have noticed that the Taittirīya Upanishad went so far as to make the Prayer-force the support, the limbs on which stands the man made of bliss. Now we arrive at the more abstract concept that the brahman is simply the quality bliss (**ānanda**).

That is the view we find in Yājnavalkya. He counts the blisses to King Janaka, according to their intensity, one above another, the bliss of the wealthy and dominant among men, the bliss of the Fathers in the world just above us, the bliss of the Sky-elves who sing in a realm still higher, the bliss of successively higher realms of the gods, and above these again, supreme and final, the bliss of the brahman-world, and finds that world the highest world, and its bliss the bliss that is greatest of all.

As to the character of this bliss we notice that the progress of the Person to the man of bliss in the Taittirīya is from embodiment in food (the body of the flesh) to embodiment in air-currents (the network of breaths), thence to embodiment in selfish purpose, and thence again to embodiment in intelligence. It is only after these several embodiments

have been passed through that the embodiment in bliss can be entered, the support of which (the lower limbs, that is to say, on which one then stands) is the brahman.[1]

With Yājnavalkya it is only the man who is without any desire, whose only desire is the soul, that can attain to the brahman. It would seem that his view is that only after the flesh is entirely abandoned can the brahman be fully attained, yet we are to notice that he regards the brahman in incorporeal condition as no vacuous entity but glory (**tejas**[2]).'

(*b*) *The De-objectifying of the Person.*

And if thus the brahman was de-objectified, coming finally to correspond, one would say, to what we of to-day mean by Spirit: so also did the Person come to be de-objectified. The Person passed from what we have noted, the figure in the sun and the figure in the eye, to become simply the Ātman, the Self, be it the Self that resided in the figure in the Sun, or in the figure of the eye of man. There were, indeed, two figures still, the one counterpart of the other. Yet each of the two was the one Self realised as de-objectified, that is to say, as the Self in itself, independent quite of a bodily form.

(vi) *The Sixth Step: Being is the World and the Self.*

The next step on the pathway of escape from the magic ritual we may take to be the New Philosophy that Uddālaka reports to his son Śvetaketu: 'In the beginning, my dear, this world was simply Being (**sat**), one only, without a second'[3]: an announcement that is the foundation stone of all Hindu philosophy to this day.

[1] Selection 3.

[2] **tējas**, n.1., sharpness, edge; 2. tip of flame or ray; gleaming splendour; fire; 3. (splendour, i.e.), beauty of person; 4. (*like Eng.* fire, i.e.), energy, vigor, power; 5. moral *or* magic power; influence, dignity; majesty. [√**tij** be sharp. Orig. *stig: cf. Gk. *stizō*, prick; *stig-ma*, prick. Lat. *in-stigare*, prick on; Eng. *stick*, pierce.] [L].

"The ground-significance of the word is 'sharpness' (etymologically related to *stigma*, etc.); from which is derived under the Indian sun the meaning 'glow, heat, fire,' and also 'brilliance.' **Tejas** is the mysterious magic power that is the property of certain classes of beings and also of certain objects and substances in nature and that shows itself as glow or brilliance of light." [J. Ph. Vogel in his lecture *Het sancrit woord 'tejas,'* pub. Amsterdam, 1930, as reviewed approvingly by H. Windisch in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 20 Dec., 1930.]

[3] See note on p. 177.

As we listen to the sage's teaching we perceive that it is no abstract Being that is here meant, but Being 'credited' as our two Indian scholars, Belvalkar and Ranade, point out, 'with powers of perception and thought.'[1] "It bethought itself (**aikṣata**)[2]," Uddālaka tells Śvetaketu: "'Would that I were many! Let me procreate myself!' It emitted heat. That heat bethought itself: 'Would that I were many! Let me procreate myself.' It emitted water. Therefore whenever a person grieves or perspires from the heat there is produced water [in tears or in perspiration]. That water bethought itself: 'Would that I were many! Let me procreate myself!' It emitted food. Therefore whenever it rains, there is abundant food."[3]

More than that. We find later on that Being is actually described as *possessing a self*. "That divinity[4] [i.e. Being] bethought itself: 'Come! Let me enter these three divinities [i.e. heat, water, food] with this living *Self* [**ātman**] and separate out name and form.'"[5]

To bring home the newly arrived-at philosophy Uddālaka finally presents eight Parables. Being is described in these as the subtle essence out of which emerge the various forms we behold, tiger, lion, wolf, bear, worm, fly, and so on, and into which they return.[6] It is also the invisible within the seed from which the tree springs and the invisible life of the tree while the tree exists. We are not, however, to understand that the subtle essence is here thought of as only the unseen potential power within the seed or only the unseen current moving within the tree that makes the tree live. It is the whole seed, the whole tree. It is that which makes the seed to exist as a seed and the tree to exist as a tree. In brief, the seed is the essence showing itself in form of a seed, the tree is the essence showing itself in form of a tree. In fact, each particular of the world is the essence in the form of that particular and the world as a whole is simply the essence in the wholeness we feel the world

[1] CP., p. 226.

[2] **Aikṣata,** 3. sing. Imperfect Middle of √**īkṣ**: look; look at; see; behold. [desiderative of √***aś,** 'see,' contained in **ak-ṣán,** 'eye,' etc.] [L.]

[3] CU.6.2.2–4. [H].

[4] **Devátā,** the word for 'divinity' in Sanskrit is feminine. [5] CU. 6.3.2.

[6] The emergence, Yājnavalkya teaches, takes place at birth, the return at death. Also, return is made with entrance into deep dreamless sleep and emergence at waking therefrom.

to be. Were these not the essence, and the essence in that particular mode, they would not exist in the form in which we see them. In a word, this subtle essence is Being, and so everything must embody it or that thing would not exist. But this subtle essence does not give existence only to life and matter. It is not only what one would call physical reality. It is truth in the widest sense of the term. It includes moral truth. It is the truth that preserves through his ordeal the truth-speaker who has been accused of telling a lie.

So, after each parable, the Sage recites this refrain:

"That which is the finest essence.[1] This whole world is that which has That [namely, Being] as it's self (ātman) [that is to say, enabling it to exist as the world]. That is Reality (**satya**). That is the Self (**Ātman**). That art thou, O Śvetaketu."

(vii) *The Seventh and Final Stage of the Escape from the Magic and Acquisitive Ritual to the Glory of the Self, the Classic Doctrine: The Self is Being with Spirit as its quality.*

What is the state of things now? We have watched the de-objectifying of the Prayer-force into the Spirit, of the World-person into the Self of the Sun and the Self of man.

Now has Uddālaka brought forward Being, one without a second, as that from which all things have been derived and from which they, by the entering of Being into them with his living self, derive their name and form. He has told his pupil that Being is the subtle essence that constitutes the existence of everything: that it is the Self of the World; the Self of the pupil addressed; the Self in itself; in brief, Reality.

We seem to have five principles here:

(1) Being; quasi-personal, as Uddālaka has described it;
(2) The Self that makes the world to be the world;
(3) The Self that makes each man to be a man;
(4) The Self in itself;
(5) Reality.

Evidently we want to know the proper value of each of these and the relation they bear to each other.

[1] 'finest essence'; Sanskrit, **aṇ-i-mán**, m. thinness, subtility; **áṇu**, adj. minute, subtle, delicate; m. atom. [M.]

(*a*) *The Self.*

It remained for one whom we have already mentioned,[1] a pupil of Uddālaka's, and his successor in a long line of Upanishad teachers,[2] not one of the Chanting priests, as his master was, but of the Class of Priests that undertook the Manual Acts of the sacrifice, the sharp-witted Yājnavalkya with salt in his speech, to clarify the great announcement we have just analysed.

Yājnavalkya it was, who was famous for his clearing of text from comment in the Commentaries on the Ritual; putting, that is to say, the formulae in one series, and the priestly discourses, or **brāhmaṇas**, which commented on the ritual of the sacrifice, in another series. This mode of presentation was known as the White Veda for the Sacrifice (White Yajur-Veda), because of its being in that way cleared or sifted, duly arranged. The unseparated form was called in contradistinction the Black Veda for the Sacrifice.

So we have here now another clarifying, the clarifying we have just stated, of the announcement of his master with regard to the new philosophy. It was a clarifying, we are to observe, not a contradiction. With Uddālaka there was but One essence, namely, Being, and it was, if not personal, semi-personal. But Uddālaka brought in, as we have seen, several principles and their meaning and relationship to each other was obscure. With Yājnavalkya the Person is the One, and there is no doubt in Yājnavalkya's teaching as to his personality or that he is the One. It is this One Person who is the Self in each man and the Self of the World. There are not two Selves, one human, the other cosmic, but only One Self. Out of the One Self all proceeds, and it is on account of having the One Self as their inner thread that all things have their being and movement. It seems that we might express the difference between the two philosophers this way: With Uddālaka Being is the Self; with Yājnavalkya, the Self is Being. Here, then, is the Glory of the Self, the Final Step (the Seventh as we have counted the stages, in the path of escape from the Magic and Acquisitive Ritual), the harbour of security and inner contentment, reached at last, the great Classic Doctrine of the Upanishads.

[1] P. 36. [2] List of Teachers: BAU. 6.5., 1-3.

The most complete exposition by Yājnavalkya of his doctrine of the Self is found in his speech to his philosophical wife Maitreyī, given in our Selection 13. He is on the point of departing, as was the custom with these sages, for meditation in the forest as the closing stage of his life, and therefore expresses his desire to make a settlement for Maitreyī from his estate. Maitreyī accordingly takes occasion to ask whether wealth, were it all the wealth of the world, would make her immortal. On the sage answering that she would thereby be rich, but that through wealth there was no hope of immortality, Maitreyī entreats the sage to tell her what he knows, and so is he led to disclose to her his great secret.

First, he points out the devotion everyone has to the Self, or, as we had better with Hume translate the word 'the Soul' (so as to avoid any thought of selfishness, which is the last thing this doctrine implies). It is not for love of the husband that a husband is dear, he begins (suitably enough, seeing he is addressing his devoted Maitreyī), but for love of the Soul is a husband dear. So also is it with the husband toward his wife. Not because she is a wife is she dear, but for love of the Soul. So is it also, the sage proceeds, with sons, wealth, cattle, the priesthood, and so on. Not one of these is dear in itself, but for love of the Soul is each dear.

Next Yājnavalkya points out that all activities and sensations in the world are the media of the activity and sensibility of the Self. As all waters, O Maitreyī, meet in the sea, so all touches meet in the skin wherever skin may be, for that is the organ of touch for the Self: so also all odours find their place in the nose of all creatures, the Self's organ for smelling; all forms in the eye, the Self's organ for seeing; all knowledges in the heart, for in the heart it is that the Self holds his mind[1]; all journeyings in the feet for by means of feet the Self moves about.

Further, we have a speech of Yājnavalkaya's to his old teacher Uddālaka in which he describes the Self as the Controller, the Inner Thread, of all the things that there are in the world, that which makes everything move as the inner

[1] We shall remember that the heart is regarded as the seat of the mind, and that the mind (manas) is regarded as including the emotion and will as well as the intellect.

sinews and strands of the body make the limbs of the body to move.[1] And in the discourse to Maitreyī we find him describe the Self as a drummer, a blower of a conch-shell, a player on a lute, the world being the drum, the conch-shell, the lute, that is played on.

Also, all things are breathed out of the Self, he tells Maitreyī, just as smoke is sent up from a damped fire, the sacred hymns, legends, sciences, sacrifices, oblations, food, drink, this world and the other world, and all beings.

In fact, 'everything here,' in one part of his speech to her he declares, 'is what the Self is.'

As to the status and quality of the Self, he pronounces it in his discourse to King Janaka to be One and only and Unborn, and in the address to Maitreyī to be imperishable and indestructible.

But perhaps the most distinctive teaching of Yājnavalkya is the last feature we noted in our summary in the opening paragraph of this section, namely, that only on itself is the Self dependent for existence. In fact, it *is* existence. We have seen Uddālaka had that already in his mind, although not clearly enough. It not only contains all, but it has no one and nothing outside it. It is the only seer, smeller, taster, thinker. It must, therefore, always exist and always possess its faculties. Let death come, and with it the Self see no longer with the eyes or smell or hear, taste or think, by means of the several organs it possesses in this life for these sensations and activities, yet see and taste and smell and hear and think it must, for the only seer, taster, thinker, cannot die.

It is with this prime phase of the Self that Yājnavalkya closes his instruction of Maitreyī, who, longing to know what might make her immortal, had requested him to tell her what he knew. His last words as he parts from her are: 'Such, lo, indeed, Maitreyī, is immortality.'

(*b*) *The Spirit.*

So much for the Self. The reader perhaps now asks: Has the Self ousted the Prayer-force which lifted the hearts of the poets so that they composed the songs which induced

[1] BAU. 3. 7.

the gods graciously to grant the patron's desires, the magic-force in the incantations that was so strong that it compelled the gods to act automically, but now, de-objectified and purified in the course of this thinking, has become, we would say, very nearly what we moderns of to-day understand when we speak of the Spirit? Has it in the teaching of Yājnavalkya fallen out of account?

Not so indeed. With him it is playing a greater rôle than before. The **brahman** is no longer, as it was for the student in the wilderness, simply a power in nature including man's sense-organs, no longer even simply the afflatus of prayer and praise as it was for the poet, or the god-compelling spell of the enchanter, but spirit purely conceived, such as, we hear him tell Janaka, is only possible for the man 'devoid of desire, whose only desire is the soul.'[1] To attain to spirit was 'man's highest path, his highest achievement, his highest bliss, the bliss on which just a part thereof all other creatures live'; yea—as we have noted him saying—when the heights of bliss are detailed, each height a hundredfold higher, from bliss among men through the blisses of gods, this bliss is the highest of all.[2] When the last body of the weary succession of births is cast off, as by the snake is cast off its slough, and have thus become 'liberated all the desires that lodge in one's heart,' then, that man, 'being very spirit, to spirit retires,[3] spirit attains.'[4] 'That incorporeal immortal life,' Yājnavalkya maintains, 'is spirit indeed and glory indeed.'[5,6]

So do in his teaching the two foci of the sacrifice at last become One Principle, the Self being its essence, the Spirit the quality of the essence.

The Triumph of Yājnavalkya.

Such then was the triumph of Yājnavalkya. He had thought out into clearness the teaching of his great master,

[1] BAU. 4. 4. 6b; p. 127.

[2] BAU. 4. 3. 32, 33; p. 122.

[3] **apy-eti**, retires unto (with accusative); √**i**, go+**api**, unto.

[4] 'attains,' **sam-aśnute**: √**aś**, reach; attain; obtain, get. [L.] The sam, 'together,' denotes completeness of attainment.

[5] glory, **tejas**; note on **tejas** on p. 37.

[6] BAU. 4. 6b, 7a; p. 127.

Uddālaka. He had discovered that the 'One Being' of his master was the Self within each man's own breast, the Soul of the World; completely contained within itself, immortal, its energy—spirit. For him just to know that meant the attainment of salvation, when at last the life of sense should be entirely laid by.

At a public disputation a persistent inquirer more eager to outwit the sage than to discover the truth, asked him: 'On what, Yājnavalkya, is the heart based?' 'You idiot,' he replied, 'that you will think that it could be anywhere else than in ourselves: for if it were anywhere else than in ourselves, the dogs might eat it or the birds might tear it to pieces.'[1]

One has seen it stated that there are certain great men who make those who listen to them feel small, other great men who make their listeners feel great. Surely this latter must have been the experience of those who heard the teaching of Yājnavalkya. We find the king we have mentioned promise during the instruction that is our Selection 12, largesse to the sage time after time, if only he will tell him still more for his soul's release, until at last, the secret revealed, the King offers to give him his subjects and himself as well to become his servants.

(c) *The Reality of the World.*

It is held by some critics that this doctrine of the independence and all-containedness of the Self involves a belief in the unreality of the world.

That inference is firmly denied by Professor E. W. Hopkins, who thus writes:

> For the authors of the early Upanishads the objective exists just as much as the subjective; it is a part of the subjective. This is in fact the great discovery, not that the world is **māyā**, illusion, but that it is real, not in being the ultimate, but in being a form of the subjective. The former view is **moha**, delusion (materialism), the latter is the highest truth . . . namely, that the Infinite is Ātman [the Self], that Ātman is all that is; whatever is, is Soul (Self), and out of Soul as part of Soul comes the whole world, as expressed in the Chāndogya Upanishad (The Secret Teaching in the Chant): "The Soul is below. The Soul is

[1] BAU. 3. 9. 25 [H].

above. The Soul is to the West. The Soul is to the East. The Soul indeed is this whole world. Indeed this whole world is from the Soul."[1]

XII. The Necessity that the Self Transcendent should enable the Self in the Flesh to know its true Nature.

We may be said to have finished our task. We have brought the Forest Fathers to their final step, the knowledge of the true Dignity of the Self. It was their conviction that only to know that Dignity was sufficient for salvation.

Further, they believed that this saving knowledge might be attained, if only one was possessed of sufficient intelligence and diligence in his thinking.

A later School of sages, however, arose, who contested this last belief. They taught the futility of intelligence and learning for the obtaining of such knowledge. The Self, they said, as we realise it in our breast, had become caught in the succession of births of the flesh, like a swan caught in a blinding whirlpool. That surge of the flesh prevented the overwhelmed self from seeing its true self, the Transcendent, in its composure above the flood. With this shutting-off of the Transcendent from view ignorance arose in its mind as to its true nature. It was necessary that the Transcendent Self should, as it were, stoop down, and touch the eyes of the self overwhelmed by the flood, so that this ignorance might be removed and the distracted one behold in its mind its true Self in tranquility, so that, at the sight of that glory, the flood, however strong it might be, should no more distress it, and thus its peace at last be attained.

Such is the teaching described in our final Selection.

XIII. Recapitulation.

Let us briefly review. We shall remember that we began with two periods, which were inferred from such of the language as has been handed down; namely, First, the Age of the Original Indo-European speakers when they were passing, most likely on the Hungarian plain, from the nomad-shepherd to the agricultural stage; and Second, the

[1] E. W. Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 1901, Vol. XXII, p. 386. Quotation from CU. 7. 25, 26. [H.]

Age of the Airyas, who had trekked from the Indo-European host and had finally settled south and east of the Caspian Sea.

Next came the three periods of the Sacred Tradition; the First, the Age of the Veda, when the Veda of the Hymns (the Rigveda) was composed, and when (at the close of the period) the Collection of Spells (the Atharvāngirasas) appeared; the Second, the Age of the Dominance of the Magic and Acquisitive Ritual, when the Veda to accompany the acts of the Sacrifice (the Yajur-Veda) and the Veda for chanting thereat (the Sāma-Veda) were put together and the Commentaries begun and extended; the Third, the Age of the Upanishads. We are to note that these three periods did not suddenly commence, and passed, one into the next, in leisurely fashion.

The Selections

BRIEF ADVICE TO THE READER

THE teaching presented here, although it is little more than thirty years since its documents have been translated into a European tongue, has from many centuries before the Christian era woven itself into the higher thought of the peoples of India.

It needs sifting and enlarging. At that we need not be surprised, when we consider that it was arrived at by thinkers who, earnest and sharp-witted although they were, had come to it after having just shaken off a degraded mode of a noble and yet comparatively primitive form of religion, in which they had been priests, and in which they still took a certain amount of interest; and who, besides, although it would seem that they lived at the time of the great Hebrew prophets, yet had to do their thinking entirely by themselves, shut off as they were by the great mountain barriers of India from the rest of mankind.

The sacred caste to which they belonged called themselves from old time Men of the Spirit. And it was chiefly concerning the Spirit, that had moved in the hymns of their early poets, and now moved in prayers taken therefrom that had become for their caste incantations, that these thinkers, withdrawn into the quietude of the forest, had set themselves to inquire. Not that they were alone in their several retreats, or that they only meditated. They were married men and possessed cattle and the popular among them had perhaps a score of resident pupils of their own spiritual caste that stayed with them from the eve of puberty until marriage, or—if they did not marry—until it might be, as we learn from one of our selections, their four and twentieth year. These thinkers still took an interest in the sacrifice and, at all events, attended meetings of students of the sacrifice. And they took missionary journeys for the teaching of their newly found faith to their

fellow Men of the Spirit. We find kings taking an interest in their views and inviting them to hold disputation with their brethren in the royal presence.

They were careful with regard to their teaching. They inculcated a general reverence for truth. They received as pupils only members of their own sacred caste. The pupil was solemnly installed. What was taught was transmitted as 'upanishad' [secret]. (The word upanishad means 'sitting near [a teacher]'.) The course they required was not only instruction but strict moral discipline. When it was over the student had to bathe himself, so that the holy contagion of what was taught might not affect injuriously the unwary in the world of ordinary intercourse to which he returned.

It is for those of the West who have this teaching brought before them to observe this reverence, discipline, and caution, connected with it. It will be found that its character will then be better understood and its place in our own scheme of thought more fitly assigned.

Concerning the translation the reader is asked to note that the first two Selections, being of a mythological character and much compressed, have needed much and somewhat problematical expansion. The translator hopes, however, that he has presented their true meaning. A literal translation is given as Appendices I and II in order that the reader may form his own opinion.

Such compressed mythological statement, however, happily belongs only to the initial stage of this course of thought. The main and later teaching is expressed plainly in terms of ordinary experience. The translator has accordingly in the subsequent Selections had only to render the original as accurately as he could word for word. Only brief and very occasional explanations he has permitted himself and these only to give point.

Pronunciation of Sanskrit

a = the neutral vowel, as, for example, the *u* in 'but.'

ī = *e* in 'mete.'

ū = *oo* in 'moot.'

ṛ = a smooth or untrilled *r*-sound.

ḷ = a smooth *l*-sound, that is an *l*-sound without the *l* being emphasised.

c = *ch* in 'church.'

ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, ḍh are domal sounds, that is, pronounced, according to all the native authorities, Whitney in his *Sanskrit Grammar* informs us, as "uttered with the tip of the tongue turned up and drawn back into the dome of the palate (somewhat as the usual English smooth *r* is pronounced)."

ś = *sh* as the *sh*-sound is produced in the *s* of the word 'eschew.'

ṣ = *sh*, pronounced as a domal sound.

h must always be given its *h* value.

ḥ is a final *h*-sound uttered (to quote Whitney again) "in the articulating position of the preceding vowel."

ṅ *or* **ṁ** is (again Whitney): "A nasal sound lacking that closure of the organs which is required to make a nasal-mute or contact-sound; in its utterance there is a nasal resonance along with some degree of openness of the mouth."

I

THE WORLD AS THE HORSE-SACRIFICE:

BEING THE FIRST COMMENTARY
ON THE RITUAL IN

The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The World as the Horse-Sacrifice

I. THE FIRST, EXTERNAL, ASPECT: THE HORSE AT LIBERTY BEFORE ITS SACRIFICE.

A. The Horse Described.

On Horse's back we launch away,
His mane—those clouds all-rippled grey;
Thorough the grey yon crinkling red—
Reflexions cast by rising head;
The courser's back—that stretch of sky,
This wind—his breath, that sun—his eye.
These rivers running near and far
The entrails of his body are;
His paunch's fill—these drifts of sand;
Above the drifts those mountains stand—
His lungs and liver. Debonair
His hide behold, with trees for hair;
His flesh—those clouds that low and high
Amass in dapple through the sky.
His yawnings are the lightning's pranks
North south east west about his flanks.
O hark the rain! Each lake doth boil
Surcharged with yeast in wild turmoil.
His are the speeding years we ride,

His heat—the warmth in all descried.
Strikes out his hoof each new-flashed day.
The moon! O see it dance away!
One leap of his, a year is fled;
His vibrant tail—the stars outspread!
Voice is his voice; 't is he we hear
When e'er salutes a voice our ear.
So urge we on, on mad course hurled,
Thou, I, and others, all the world![1]

B. THE HORSE'S TRANSFORMATIONS TO SUIT HIS RIDERS.

Bearer diverse becometh he:
With gods—a courser running free;
With elves in sky—a stallion flame:
With demons—'scorcher' for his name;
With men—a slave of much resource,
A homely creature just a 'horse.'

So taught the East the World doth fill
A part fulfilling each man's will:
For rider each, cause good or ill
For which he hath his flag unfurled,
As be the rider, so his world,
A steed for him of just the breed
To bear him to his nature's deed.

II. THE SECOND, INNER, ASPECT: THE WORLD AS THE HORSE ALREADY SLAIN FOR SACRIFICE.

But after that, not yet content,
These Easterns insight deeper bent:

Day as a vessel swimming red
We mark rise with the Horse's head
And Night fall past the Western brink,
A bowl filled red, while He doth sink.
Seem these two twilights in our eyes
To glow with blood of sacrifice,
In these poured in, from these poured out,
Its shining putting dark to rout,
Rich mantling in these vessels twain,
The heart's red stream of One fresh slain,

[1] This stanza is Paul Eberhardt's spirited paraphrase in his *Der Weisheit Letzter Schluss*, put into English.

Yea of the All for all self-bled,
At haunch one bowl and one at head,
Signs vivid in impassioned skies
Of one tremendous sacrifice,
The cosmic verity beheld
Of greatest sacrifice of eld
When 'fore the kings who owned his sway
A king of kings a horse did slay,
With altar-fires the flesh did blend,
And thus to heaven an offering send,
So potent that complete thereby
Was made Creation's Lord on high;
The offerer too became complete,
And all things found atonement meet;
Yea by the gods themselves 't was owned
That they thereby all sins atoned.

So did these men the Law descry;
"The All to be the All must die,
Unto the All itself must give,
The All thereby in it to live."
And so the World to being came,
Truth of the Horse devote in flame.
But what then of the boisterous ride?
These wise men now set that aside.
Seemed now the world before their eyes
One constant, rising, sacrifice,
No foray of self-will and pride,
No wild unbridled madcap ride,
But immolation of desire,
The self subjéct to mordant fire,
From dawn to sunset life laid down,
An offering's smoke Creation's crown—
Pale floating wreaths of self's Last dross—
The World the triumph of the Cross.

III. THE SOURCE OF THE HORSE.

Whence came the Horse, was next their quest.
Their finding this, they told with zest:

Behold his up-and-down-ward path:
The Flood as mother-place he hath.
From That, where morn her golden cup
Presents, his head he reareth up:
See how his freshly-glowing eye

Kindles with light the Eastern sky!
And where the Eve her silver urn
Lets down, he there doth make return.
So from and to these Waters One,
That, reddened, through these twain bowls run,
Tincting the dawn and dark with rose,
Out of the Flood and back, he goes,
The Waters of Eternal Peace,
Whence all things rose, where all things cease,
The everlasting pristine main;
From that, to that, again, again.
In that great placid deep is set
The power that did the Horse beget,
And thence it is throughout his drive
He doth his constant verve derive.

IV. SUMMARY.

So, in this One entwining Dance
Of pulse and flash and circumstance
First saw these wise what all men see
The fling of self-willed riotry;
But next self-sacrifice they saw
To be in truth its inmost law;
Next fount descried, to meet the cost
Of leap so strong, so tempest-tossed,
That it might ever rise not cease,
The placid depth of Endless Peace.

2

THE EVOLUTION OF THE COSMOS OR THE ATTAINMENT BY DEATH OF HIS TRUE BODY

BEING THE SECOND COMMENTARY
ON THE RITUAL IN

The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The Evolution of the Cosmos or The Attainment by Death of his True Body

which, being the Body of the Self (or Spirit) of Death, is a Body of Complete Self-Sacrifice.

This body is displayed in miniature in ritual fashion in the Horse Sacrifice.

ANALYSIS.

A. INTRODUCTION.

B. THE PROCESS OF EVOLUTION.

i. *The World at the Beginning was nothing else but Death.* Yet the Upanishad evidently presents him as the Self, for we find him 'making up his mind' and otherwise showing Self-hood (p. 56).

ii. *The Mind of Death awakening in him, Death realises his emptiness and therefore goes on yearning for a body.* This is no more than a yearning; Mind is indeed at the root of it, but Mind is not fully awake (Note that mind according to the Rigveda is in the heart and includes sensation, will, and thought). (p. 57).

iii. *First Stage: Evolution of the Body (or World) of Force,* the World of Matter or Force, the Material Body.

Impelled by his yearning for a body, Death evolves force from himself, thus producing a material body of himself, the Material World.

Yet Death is not satisfied. The Material World is not his proper body, nor his food (p. 58).

iv. *Second Stage: The Evolution of the Body (or World) of Life*, the World of Matter inflate with Mind (sensation, will, thought), the Psychic Body. Death's mind is now fully awake and he uses it, inasmuch as by means of his Mind he takes Voice to wife, that is, he interpenetrates Voice with Mind. He thus begets of Voice, as the issue of his Mind by her, the Psychic World, as his Body. Thus is the World of Life evolved from the World of Matter (p. 60).

It is from this Body of Life indeed that sound at last becomes Voice, Voice being Sound inflate with Mind (p. 61).

Death would fain have this issue of his Mind, the World of Life, as his True Body and his Food, but this Body, the Body of his Mind conflate with matter, will not sacrifice itself to him (p. 62). This rejection brings about the degradation of the World of Life (p. 64) and is discovered by Death to threaten the degradation of himself (p. 68).

v. *Third Stage: The Evolution of the Body (or World) of the Spirit (or Self) of Death, which is Sacrifice*, the Spiritual Body.

The Spirit (or Self) of Death now assumes supreme control (p. 69).

That is its true office, for the Self is superior to both Matter (Force) and Mind.

His true self thus active, Death now evolves from himself into the World of Life a Body that is not inflate with such externalities as force or mind, which combined make the World of Life; but is, without intervention of these, directly inflate with his Spirit (or Self). This Body is accordingly an immediate expression of himself. That being the case, and since Death is ever giving up himself, so is this Body ever giving up itself; or, in other words, is ever returning to

Death from whom it came. This is the Body of Sacrifice, the Body that comes into existence only to forthwith pass away (p. 70).

This then is Death's true Body. With this Body, as expression of himself and engine of his activity and as his food, he is at last satisfied.

This Body is the true Horse Sacrifice, of which the horse-sacrifice offered by men is only the ritual miniature.

C. EPILOGUE ON THE TWO FIRES.

The Fire on Earth and the Fire in Heaven.

(A) The Two Fires: i. The Fire on Earth (p. 72); ii. The Fire in Heaven (p. 74).

(B) The Two Fires are One Divinity (p. 76).

(C) The Triumph of him who knows this.

A. INTRODUCTION.

Our wise men so, in Intimation First,[1]
As thou hast heard, this labyrinthine world,
Entwining aye, within, alow, aloft,
Perceived to be that very sacrifice
Devote by kings of kings when they a horse
Did slay and lift in fire, these sages' eye
Well trained by thought to search the rite,
Its secret find. And thou dost now exclaim
"So then this World a great Oblation is!"
And askest "How came that to be?" List, then,
My dear.

B. THE PROCESS OF EVOLUTION.

I. DEATH AT THE BEGINNING.

At first was Death. Yea, all with Death
Was covered. Nothing was, my dear, save Death.
The which did mean an utter emptiness,
And emptiness, mark thou, is Hunger's self.

[1] The First Commentary on the Ritual (Selection 1).

II. DEATH, HIS MIND AWAKENING IN HIM, REALISES HIS EMPTINESS AND GOES ON YEARNING FOR A BODY.

So, being Hunger's self, Death thus made up
His Mind: "O would that I embodied were,
That, with beholding of myself, this blank may cease,
And wherewith, as with instrument, I food
May find; yea, which itself shall be my food,
So that I may at last be filled!"—no speech,
For speech he had not yet brought forth, but just
The thought repeatedly in him arose
That must from emptiness arise, "O would
That I a body had, a body had!"

III. FIRST STAGE: THE EVOLUTION OF THE BODY OF FORCE, THE MATERIAL BODY.

The Preparation of the Platform for the Ascetic.

So 'went he on' with that refrain; which means
He 'praised,' for **ácarat**, the Sanskrit word
For 'he went on' doth **ṛc** include, and **ṛc**
Means 'praise' (O mark thou well how much doth Voice
When we her words inspect, make known!) Then thought
He next "While I was praising, pleasure (**kam**)
Had I; which revelation voice confirms,
For **ca** which is disclosed in **ṛc** doth rest
Within the throat on **ka**, and **ka** or **kam**
Doth 'pleasure' mean: the which must be, for who
That praises hath not pleasure? Note that **ar**
Is also found in **ṛc**, and that, with **ka**
And **ar** combined, **arká** arises, which,
Thou knowest, meaneth 'gleam.' And what is gleam
But essence of the waters, waters' self?
Mark from the cloud as mother spring the 'gleam'
We call the lightning, winning thus the name
We give it—'waters' son.' So, self arrived,
The self's embodiment, the waters, next
We see, the flood primeval, through the which
There welled up froth, the surge beclouding, and,
In solid falling, 'earth' becoming, Earth
We walk on come to be!

The Ascetic on the Platform evolves Heat.

But more he did.
Upon that floor of Earth he set himself,
Austerity in divers ways contrived
Until did heat arise from him that turned
To sweat that flowed amain in threefold stream:
Fire,—see its pulsing beads upon his far
Periphery (the stars we nightly view);
The Sun, the eye of him who in the Fire
Doth flow; and, with the Fire and Sun, the Wind,
Which now we find to Fire and Sun keep close,
Exhilarating with its breath the Fire,
And fore the Sun, at rise and set thereof,
Raising its crooning serenade. Still so
He doth himself divide, trifluent stream,
Sun, Fire and Wind, the universal surge
Of breathings all, wherein we now are borne.

The Spectacle of the Material World.

See now his frame majestic, giant ox,
That steadfast in the waters stands, the earth—
His chest, the east—his head, his back—the sky,
His body—this great bulging air, the west—
His tail. The man who knows that steadfast stand
Is steadfast wheresoe'er he goes.

Dissatisfaction.

But note,
Although thuswise he had from out himself,
With self-inflicted stricture so severe,
Movements and shapings manifold, diverse
In size and hue, past numbering, produced,
Uniqueness as a gift on each bestowed,
And each one set upon its own career,
Thus far made each to selfhood proximate,
Thus far set bounds upon his sovereignty;
Yet not in that magnificent array
Of fashionings unique did he descry
The body that he yearned to have, nor find
The food that should him satisfy and build;
Be it the gleam (**arká**) that erst did come

And cometh still each morn; be it the flood,
That next broke forth and still in cloud and stream
And dropping rain divides; or the spun froth
That did the lymph becloud and earth became
Now firm beneath our feet and overhead
In lofty hills; or that fierce stream of heat
And sweat that on his far periphery
Rolled out the luminous beads we now do see
Burning and flickering 'gainst the dark, the stream
That still its three fold course pursues in fire
And sun and air. Not one of these which he
With such restriction had evolved, nor all
Of these, greatest to most minute, combined,
Did he account as that which could for him
His emptiness make good, make manifest
Himself unto himself, body, so far
As he, the bodiless, might manifest
Become; be that whereby his pulse should beat,
And sense, emotion, will, transpire as in
True body they assert; be instrument
Wherewith, within a world inanimate,
He might his purpose execute, and might
That world not only into honour bring
Of service, but also make it more replete,
And, in his judgment, nobler in itself,
And so become his food, his apanage,
Whereby e'en he, the source of all, should be
Sustained and strengthened, in himself and for
His work, and which should, as did meaning dawn,
Find in that giving of itself to him
A joy unspeakable; in brief, not yet
The Body that the All need have,
Nor Body yet that should the All reflect
And of the all be instrument,
For force alone as yet did he behold
Objectified. Such the defect detect
In things external, but did more appall
The lack within. True, he himself was there
And had a mind (Thou hast just heard that he
'Made up his mind') but just in that, his mind,
Dissatisfaction reigned. So still he yearned

With yearning yet unvoiced, "O would that I!
That I! O would that I embodied were!"

The Great Discovery.

Then came he to discover that, if he
His proper body would bring forth, wherein
Should stir the currents not of force alone,
But also of desire and thought and will,
He did require a body to beget
Of voice by means of mind, a body thus
Embodying mind and from the womb of voice
Brought forth, Voice his beloved wife, by him
Betaken to him in himself, for man
And wife were then, as thou dost know, not yet
Dispart.

IV. Second Stage: The Evolution of the Body of Life, the Psychic Body.

The Outlook of Hope.

Deemed he, the body thus begot
Of voice by means of mind the emptiness
Should fill, that so disturbed his peace; should be
A body that, the world of force its stuff,
Should be for him, within that world of force,
Not only instrument transmitting force,
But housing also for him be, wherein
Should feeling, thought, volition, move, and, as
They moved, should, through this body, make upon
The world his own impress; yea, body that
Should be in its totality his own,
In all its varied fashions and its modes
None other than himself, and so at last
His longing should be satisfied, "O would
That I, O would that I, a body had!"

The Marriage with Voice.

Such, then, his hope. So now, throughout a year
His Voice he interwove with influence of
His mind. That energy of his is that
Long course we now behold, of days and nights,

Of light and dark half-months, the sun conducts
As north he moves then back to south, the which
We call the year; yea, thus the year did come to be,
No year before. Then waited he, while sounds
Of wind and stream and thundering cloud and launch
Of high-built snow and crash of rocks were held
To be but various tunes for heralding
The utterance intelligent he longed
To hear. Conception came, and, through the year
He had construct, he bore within himself
(For man and wife were not, remember thou,
As yet dispart) his mind now fashioning
Within his Voice, yet inarticulate,
The body which, enabling voice to be
Articulate, should bring to utterance
His mind.

Birth of the Pure Psychic Body,
the Body of his Mind Begotten of Voice.

That year of nurturing elapsed,
He brought him forth, saw sport before his eyes
The body of his mind. Had hitherto
Outside his mind been all he had produced—
The gleam, the waters, earth, sun, fire, wind;
But now within that which appeared was mind,
Inhabitant and lord of this new form,
That flung its ruddy limbs to grasp and feel
The world o' matter into which, up from
Depth o' himself, it had arisen, dazed
Startled and inquisitive, its new
Surroundings putting to the test.

The Attraction of the Psychic Body.

Allured
(This succulent and rosy image of
Himself, aglow with leaping life-blood—there!),
He oped his mouth: "My body this; so this
My food shall be!"

The Refusal of his Psychic Body to Sacrifice itself to Him.

At which great mouth
Agape on him his psychic form cried '**Bhān**!'
So mind at last did move in sound! Had now,
In that pure body of his mind, his voice
At last begun her utterance. Was now
His universe no longer dumb.

His Consequent Withdrawal from his Pure Psychic Body.

But woke
That protest 'gainst himself at once the thought
"If I against this tractive fashion of
Myself intend, less then my food shall be."

The Disastrous Effect of this Withdrawal.

Alas, that that desire should rise, for he
That 'less' of food doth fear, doth wish
Therein for 'more,' and 'more' doth 'more' again
Involve, and that 'more'—'more'; O, who may to
The series put an end? Besides, did this
Desire imply retreat from that pure form
Immediate to himself, form of all forms
Most fair, the form that one might deem indeed
To be at last, since it embodied mind,
The true expression of himself (so far
As form the formless may express), the form
That, thus embodying mind, ability
Possessed to, in that mind, conceive itself
A sacrifice to him and so become
His food, his plenishment; from That to turn
To other forms, O how inferior to
Himself; yea meant an endless budding off,
A seine cast out, unbridled, widening out
To gather, in its downward sweep, the whole
Prolific lower psychic world that round
Us now doth pullulate; thus brought to birth
Not only endless multiplicity
(Which is a degradation in itself)
But also, endless stepping down,
For now should voice, expressing his revolt
From that pure psychic body, which had him,

Alas! repelled, express itself in these
Aye lower lower forms.

The Immediate Ascent of Voice.

But first Voice rose.
Dost deem she could abide entangled in
That form of flesh, although a form so fair,
That did to give itself to him, the Lord
Supreme, who from her brought it forth, refuse?
Nay, we do teach her native place lies far
Above these prison-bars. So now we see
Her mount from height to height twixt earth and sky
Pass through the transit-porch and judgment hall
Of souls, the moon we watch add white to white
As souls press in, and part with white as souls
Are downward sent or let go onward, take
Her station past that gate upon the floor
Which is the star-pierced roof above our heads,
Floor of her native province where doth sit
The Inexpressible.

The Declamation of the Veda of the Verses.

There stablished, she,
In her true home before her Lord, no veil
Of flesh twixt her and him, in her true form,
Apart from flesh, etherial, delicate,
Recipient immediate of his mind
(The which no form can e'er comprise,
Seek as it may), by him illuminate
And from herself illuminant, as no
Man may imagine, did from her pure lips
Give forth his thought, clear as doth perfect bell
In perfectly conveyant air, the lore
Rigveda ('knowledge put in Verses') named,
Forsooth still ours, but mouthèd then by her
As never man may mouth nor human ear
Can hear, so spiritual; yet times are ours,
When, gazing on the moving throng of souls
That from the entrance of her rostrum-hall
Shines down, or when, the souls withdrawn,
The porch in gloom, hangs o'er us what we call
A moonless night, we catch if we do list

Intent, a stir above the stars, e'en words
Apprise—his words—that through the gateway come.

The Fall of Voice.

So did his Voice, tearing herself away
From that his psychic body, stung by that
Rebellious cry of **Bhān**, mount up to his
Immediate presence bodiless, and so,
In her true self, irradiate with the mind
Of him before whose throne she stood, proclaim,
Most clear ungarbled undisguised, the Rig,
The Verses that his mind make known; but then,
Effectual the poison of that cry,
Shrank back ashamed, shrank ever further back,
To fall from that high place from zone to zone,
As falls a stream from pure white snow, that crowns
A crag, adown its front precipitous,
From ledge to ledge, and so, in channels caught,
To run in ever new captivity;
Thus from her pristine declamation fell
To move in muttered Formulas wherewith
We bend the gods their worshippers to serve,
The Yajur-Veda ('Knowledge set for use
In worship'), next to sport in pattern moulds
Of music, launching, staying, shrinking with
The tune, the Sāma-Veda ('Knowledge set
For Chanting'); but as yet forsooth no guise
Material putting on; but lo! assumed
That next, no longer satisfied with sound
Alone; became the cracklings that are clad
In sacrificial robes—the shouts that ride
The leaping flames, in shining butter clothed,
The sharp reports within the heated pot
That don them waving garments of white milk
Therein oblate; integuments yet these,
Perchance, to be accounted vesture fit,
Since they, although of matter fashioned, yet
Are consecrate, and sent to heaven to feed
The gods; but lower still descended she,
Became the voice that garniture puts on
In which articulate she doth indeed

Become, but which is filled with ills and doth
Her message much distort, bodies to wit
Of human kind; and next still farther fell,
Became the drawl and moan around our farms
Embodied in our tethered beasts, thus near
To that inchoate cry with which she broke
Into the world of matter, yet not that;
Promise of better that cry bore, but this
Of lower still was prelude; for she next
Became the chirp and squeak that put them on
Cincture that wings and crawls; did peter out
At last in moving dust, the hordes no man
Can count, the tenuous lappings of the world
Of life, in which she doth herself succumb,
Throttled thereby as mighty river by
Our thirsty sands. Woeworth that rebel shout
Of that fair psychic self beheld at first
With joy, but which refused to give itself
To him who then, with yearning seized for more
And more, did turn from it to voice himself
In other forms!

The Endless Bringing Forth and Taking In.

Thus, then, did he bring forth
This total teeming endless psychic world
We see around us now, in which are we
Within these bodies held. And all thereof
That he produced did he begin to eat.
Yea, so it is with everything with him,
E'en Death, the which is Hunger's self; all that
He bringeth forth he taketh back and doth
Within himself consume. Now **ad** means 'eat'
And **Ad-iti**—'the Infinite,' by which
Doth Voice, for those who note that consonance,
The nature of the Infinite reveal,
E'en that which makes it Infinite to be.
He who this universal bringing forth
And taking in doth know, for him are all
Things food.

Yet Dissatisfaction.

But yet was he not satisfied.
The forms magnifical produced at first,

The voices multitudinous now come
With correspondent multiplicity
Of forms, no peace to him did bring.

Discipline of the Psychic.

So he,
Caparisoned with that magnificence
Out-woven from himself, not only robe
External, but in psychic strands well-nigh
His very body, throned in state, yet not
The state nor yet the body of his peace,
Did this desire: "Thus seated and thus robed,
Yet greater sacrifice, a sacrifice
More intimate, would I accordingly
Devote"; and so again to torture gave
Himself, to practise now austerity
That exercised his feelings, mind, and will;
For not was he as heretofore when from
Himself, as praising he went on, he did
The waters, earth, fire, sun, and wind, produce,
For these he then did place outside himself
And separate; but now, as hath been said,
He had by marriage of himself by means
Of mind with voice, in these brought forth
Expressions of himself, this sound or that
To be *his* voice, this form or that *his* form,
This force or that—*his* act, and so no more
Outside himself.

Temptation in the Flesh: Fame and Forcefulness seek to Overcome.

And so behold him now
In that wide psychic decadence, that is
To say the Flesh, enthroned, and, through the flesh
And o'er the flesh, exerting strength within
His later world of feeling, mind, and will,
And from that studious labour and its fruits
See now bestir, him seeking to o'ercome,
Twin powers, even Fame that struck without
Her myriad-sounding bell, and Forcefulness,
Seated within, these both peremptory

That he should count them vital breaths, the which
These two by multitudes of human kind,
Who to their psychic decadence give way,
Are suffered now to be, whose bodies they
Do make to swell, so that they plume themselves
And strut, with self-congratulation big.

Fame and Forcefulness Find no Welcome.

Not so with him. For how with Death should Fame
And Self-assertion vital breaths become?
True, when externally upon himself
He looked, he had discovered emptiness,
And, being Hunger's self, yearned then to have
His emptiness made good, and therefore built
To farthest bound the world o' matter; there
To fail embodiment to find; and now
Had framed, by marriage of himself with Voice
By means of mind, the body he had deemed
Should be his presentation true, engine
Of action, and his food; yet was he Death,
Who nought containeth, and doth forthwith that
Consigned to him to nothingness resign;
Death, who is thus with vacancy content,
Supremely resting in himself. So did
These two discover that in him there was
No harbourage. Forthwith they went.

V. THIRD STAGE: THE EVOLUTION OF THE BODY OF THE SPIRIT (OR SELF) OF DEATH, THE BODY OF SACRIFICE, THE SPIRITUAL BODY.

The Result of the Departure of Fame and Forcefulness.

And lo!
The truth that Fame and Forcefulness had now
Indeed become the vital breaths of that
Degenerate state still weighting him
Was presently made manifest, for now
That body decadent, whence these withdrew,
Began to swell, but not as bodies swell
Of pompous men we have described, for whom,
Ill-judging in their pride-infected mind,

These two are cordials indispensable,
Without which they would reckon life not life,
But with which, ruddy shining, wax they gross;
Not so with him, but, such vain boastfulness
Not found, as bodies bulge of drownèd men,
That pallid grow and hasten to decay;
Which genuine consequence to him disclosed
The depth to which his psychic form, erst pure,
Was now deject.

The Final Discovery.

So, as the vapid shell,
Gauging its own depletion, rose, so rose
Desire reversing that refusal of
His psychic self, become degenerate,
To sacrifice itself to him and his
Retreat therefrom that he might fashion for
His intake other food: "O would that I
A body had for sacrifice adept!
O would that now at last my psychic self,
Even in this divided multiple,
Would give, within the whole, within each part,
Itself to Death, holding, as end in view,
To fill the emptiness Death truly feels,
Not die the death I now behold that hath
As end decay; thus, through its death
(Within the whole, within each part) in will,
Not by dejection, reach its goal, the All
To feed, its self thus gain, retrieve as well
(Both in completeness viewed and in each part,
Although divided myriadly it be)
The comeliness of body it at first
Possessed, when, born of voice by means of mind,
It rose within the world! But how shall that
My psychic self with willingness itself
Give up, within the whole, within each part,
Unless do I, who am the Self, the very Self,
The Self that is within the psychic self,
The Self that makes that self the Self, give up
(Not in dejection, but with self-less will)
Myself, pass in through death, the self to be

In this now so degenerate psychic world,
Down the whole gamut of descending voice,
Bodied as tree of myriad buds, the self
In each of these, as each may self contain
(From self's presentments conscious felt
Down to life-pulses beating unaware)?
Myself thus gain; for I am Death that doth
Esteem, as he his inner self accounts,
The quality peculiar to himself to be
An utter absence of content, and yet
Should I, gazing beyond, behold the All,
Within which then, yea into every
Particular thereof, I should have passed,
Become my body, e'en the boundless All,
The contrary complete of nothingness.
Thus should my pristine yearning "Would that I,
Who, as I do my outer self regard,
But emptiness possess, a body had!"
At last be satisfied; not less than that,
The boundless All, required to meet desire
Of Death, who, being Death, is Hunger's self,
And, being such, complete in Hunger, so,
Alone by intusception of the All,
Become within himself secure in peace."
O note that he was there and had a mind!

The Body Fit for Sacrifice (that is the Horse Sacrifice) Arrived at.

So now the **aśva-medha** we have reached.
Note he did 'swell,' and **aśvat** meaneth 'swelled.'
Aśva means 'horse.' So we in **aśvat**, e'en
The 'swelling' that hath come, do **aśva** 'horse'
Behold. And, when the swelling he perceived,
He thought: "This **medhya** (fit for sacrifice)
Hath come to be." These two combine in one,
Then have we **aśva-medha**, just that Horse
Uplift within the flame to heaven by kings
Of kings as sacrifice in ancient day.
He verily the **aśva-medha** knows
Who knows it as we have it now declared.

The Completeness of the Sacrifice.

Behold rise thus the Sacrificial Horse,
The body that at last should bring him peace,
Since now with self-abandonment it swelled,
Big not with pride, with relegation big,
Presage of willingness to meet at last
The fire and lose itself therein, and at
His will become an offering to himself,
And so re-enter gladly him from whom
It came. Thus of his spirit body true
At last was this, responsive through and through
To sacrificial impulse (contrast clear
To his initial body of blind force
And dumb, incompetent for sacrifice,
And to his body next, of sentient life
Endowed with voice whose first-mouthed cry
Rejection meant of sacrifice to him).
So had true correspondent come at last
To him who, as the one and only Self,
Himself within each item of the world
Devotes, that, each within its grade, simply
Of matter made or psychic, be, within
The genuine body of his selfless Self,
Retrieved.

The Destined Horse in Reservation and at Liberty.

So now he kept him in his mind
For sacrifice, such time as he should will;
But sent him first upon a wide career
Through boundless space, with force in him bestowed
And granted mind—to feel, to will, to know—
Within the world material, thus a year
Thorough the seasons' rise and fall to have
His way of browse, of joy, of flight, of wheel,
Of ramp, play or revolt or strenuous pull,
Just as he would. Portrayal of him thus
Hast thou received.[1]

[1] The First Aspect of the Horse, BAU. I, 1, p. 50.

The Horse Sacrificed.

The time he willed
Passed by, he brought him to himself in flame.
So Death, that did beget the all, the all
He had begotten did through nothingness—
The only way by which may Death acquire—
Again take in; and so the tide, the flow
And ebb, of will and act, within the All,
The sending forth and calling back, the out
And in of sacrifice on part of each,
No facet set beneath his light its flash
Surrendering not, fulfilled itself.

Attainment.

Thus Death most truly did himself acquire,
No item now left outside Death. So too
Did item each to its own being come.
This interlacing, constantly reflex,
Of sacrifice it is that makes the World
We now behold the World to be; the which
To eye of those who pierce the mystery
Is day by day, as thou hast just been told,
Shown clear in mantling carnadine that tincts
The waves from which the Horse doth rise
And lights again the billows where He sinks.[1]

The Other Domestic Animals Assigned to the Gods within the All.

The Lord of Creatures and their Father thus
Took for himself the Horse. The tethered beasts
Of other kind upon our farms did he
To the divinities within the all,
Such as the sun, the moon, the fire, assign.
Therefore we see men now regard that which
To Him they consecrate and offer up
As offered up to all the gods.

[1] *The Second Aspect*, p. 51.

C. EPILOGUE ON THE TWO FIRES: THE FIRE ON EARTH AND THE FIRE IN HEAVEN.

(*a*) Two Fires.

So now
Two fires, mark thou, we count. One fire—on earth,
The other fire—in heaven.

I. · The Fire on Earth.

The fire on earth
Its rise and course to thee hath been declared.
The worlds are its embodiment.

The World of Matter.

Recall to Mind
The glow within, the yearning, when did Death
As hunger's self, survey his emptiness,
So that he did his mind make up with "O
That I a body had!"; and **ácarat**
('Went on') with that as his refrain; and so
Did 'praise,' for **ácarat** doth **ṛc** contain,
Which meaneth 'praise.' Next recollect 't was shown
That **ácarat** implieth also **ka,**
And so **arká** 'the gleam' did come; and, since
'The gleam' is waters' self, thou first didst see
The lightning issue; then the rain did come,
The flood primeval, darkening froth of which
Is this hard earth on which we tread, which he
Did take as platform whereupon himself
To torture, at which his heat and sweat arose
(Note thou the progress: 'glow,' then 'gleam,' next 'heat'),
And turned his essence into fire (note 'fire'),
Which gathered in a vortex, that our sun,
And drew as comrade to itself the wind;
And so, threefold, as fire and sun and wind,
We find he did himself divide; and did
We then behold his body grand,
The east, his head, the west—his tail,
The south and north—his flanks, the sky—his back,
The air—his belly, this broad earth—his chest:
The strong and virile water-buffalo,

A frame vast, dominating, intricate,
Material product of the yearning felt
At emptiness, which, travailing on through glow
And gleam and heat to this the earthly fire,
Did thus display its first embodiment,
Yet that no more than interveaving force,
For he not yet by means of mind had of
His Voice the psychic world, the world of life,
Begat.

The Psychic World.

But next thou learnedst, in that world
Of matter he the psychic world comprised,
Forth bringing from the womb of voice that pure
And proper psychic form thou didst behold,
Rosy and active with the surge of life,
And thou hast witnessed how therefrom at once
(For so our doctrine doth require) soared voice
To take her stand in loftiest heaven before
Her Lord, the Inexpressible, and there
Recite the Veda of the Verses. Yet,
The utterance first on earth of that pure form
Had been before his face a cry of fear
That meant refusal of that psychic self
To sacrifice itself to him, sign too
That he not yet a body had acquired
Ready for sacrifice to him; at which
Had risen in him the counter-thought: "If I
Against him shall intend, less then my food
Shall be." So, flesh-subserving, fell his voice,
Betook for its embodiment and food
Other than that pure form original,
Did ever lower forms produce. So, when
In that degenerate embodiment,
He wrought severity, there sprang two powers,
E'en Fame and Forcefulness, claiming to be
His vital breaths, thus making clear to him
That he not yet had body of his own.

The Horse Sacrifice.

And so again the glow within did burn:
"O would that I a body had that should

Look not askance at heavenward-lifting fire!"
At which awakening, did his psychic form,
(Orphan become, as thou didst hear[1], of pride)
With frame adapt for offering blossom out,
Became the Horse that sported fore the flame
And met the flame, Death's proper body now,
In which the Self of Death, that had been caught
In flesh, could, freed, unto itself return,
The sacrifice supreme which kings of kings
Alone might offer up, the sacrifice which makes
The offerer complete, the sacrifice
Which makes the gods themselves complete
That in the world he hath produced do rule.

Summary.

See then the Earthly Fire that on our hearths
Doth raise its proper, sacred, flame, of which
The crown is that great sacrifice, which hath
To thee been told, which kings of kings alone
Might lift, the clear-set miniature
Of this great ever-rising world itself,
The sacrifice perpetual; the fire
That first did glow unseen unvoiced, yet stirred
His mind to contemplate his emptiness
And build his World of Matter; so, the light,
Arká, we see break forth, as soft-eyed child
Of morning mist, the coming day, or son,
Defiance-flashing, of the thunder-cloud;
The glow that did with nobler passion urge
Again his mind in fiery year-long stream,
Which, born of voice, is This, his World of Life.
Of which are we: thus both these Worlds that Fire's
Embodiments.

II. The Fire in Heaven.

The Fire.

Yet more to tell! Hold close
Thine ear! Whisper receive! A teaching now
Is called for, higher still. Raise up thine eyes.

[1] *Fame and Forcefulness find no welcome*, p. 67.

What is that sun? Mere ball of fire? Not so!
Be these, the matter-world, the world of life,
Successively produced embodiments
Of sacrifice, subjections each of Self,
The first in lines of force alone, the next
To mind consort with force, together viewed
The passing body thus of Death, is this,
That shines o'er all, most certainly, perceived
With insight due, his eye—O canst thou doubt?
Behold its liquid gaze—the eye of him
Who doth the sacrifice upon the earth
Lay down, who doth up there unto himself
That sacrifice receive. Up there! Home of
The fathers and the gods, himself o'er these
Supreme. Here then the sacrifice, the Fire
On Earth; and there—reward, the Heavenly Fire.

The Two Embodiments of the Heavenly Fire: The March of the Year and the Psychic Body Aforesaid.

And thou hast heard that he who hath for eye
The sun, when, linked with voice, did quicken voice
With mind (strong, purposive, displayed at first
In that his bodying-forth we name the Year,
Celestial March from south to north from north
To south repeatedly) which, marking time,
As thou hast lately heard, within the womb
Of voice, came forth, the year elapsed, to sight,
His Psychic Form, his proper form, so far
As form may him present, which doth englobe
Not only that, the heaven's white fire, but, as
To thee already hath been told, that fire's
Red fringe, the earthly fire, as well, which round
The heavenly plays, the frame in which at last
His voice did come to utterance, but which
Surrender did refuse to Death, who is
Within himself contained, who to the All
Himself entirely gives, the selfless Self,
The energy that builds the world, the life
Of soul, Lord of the mutual joy above,
Where doth the gift the giver meet. Alas!

That that, his psychic form, at voice arrived,
Should that great Lord refuse, thrown down thereby
To fall and fall in self and mind and form.

(*b*) THESE TWO FIRES ARE ONE DIVINITY.

Thus these two fires, the Fire on Earth, the Fire
In Heaven, are One Divinity, e'en Death.

(*c*) THE TRIUMPH OF HIM WHO KNOWS THIS.

And he who doth this know, though he shall die
He shall not die again, for then doth Death
Become his self. He, dying here, doth rise
With Death, yea one of these divinities
Becomes, that rise in triumph in the flame.

3

THE EMANATIONS FROM AND THE RETURN TO ITSELF OF THE UNITIVE SELF:

From the Secret Teaching to the Partridge-Disciples.

The Emanations from and the Return to itself of the Unitive Self

I. Introduction.
II. The Descent: Six Increasingly Gross Emanations from the Self. At last—the Person.
III. The Ascent: Five Increasingly Ethereal Persons.
IV. Identity with the Sun.
V. The Return Briefly Described.
VI. The Rapturous Song of the Unitive Self returned to Itself.

I. INTRODUCTION.

Om! He who knows the Spirit mounteth high.
To that this verse we quote doth testify:

> The man, who Spirit as existence, consciousness, the infinite,
> Into the hiding-place [the heart] set down, set also in the height
> Of farthest ether, knows, he all desires obtains;
> The Spirit too, that doth its tremor ken, he gains.

II. THE DESCENT: SIX INCREASINGLY GROSS EMANATIONS FROM THE SELF; AT LAST—THE PERSON.

From this great Self Space came to be
Whereinto clear and far we see.
Then out of Space the Wind did blow.

And out of Wind the Fire did glow.
From Fire the Waters took their birth.
Out of the Waters merged the Earth.
Out of the Earth then Food arose;
And 't is from Food the Person grows.

III. THE ASCENT: THE FIVE INCREASINGLY ETHEREAL PERSONS THAT WING THEIR WAY UP, ONE THROUGH THE OTHER, BACK TO UNITIVE SELF.

1. The First, the Outermost, Form: Made of the Essence of Food.

The Head.
The Right Wing: The Right Arm.
The Left Wing: The Left Arm.
The Body.
The Tail, the Support: The Legs.

And so the Person now our scrutiny descries
At last from food, or rather from food's essence, rise.
[The teacher touched his head his arms his body feet,
That in his pupil's sight he might this person mete,
Comparing with these terms of 'head,' 'wings,' 'body,' 'tail,'
Man to the bird that makes for sky and there doth sail;
For as the swan that far aloft his way doth make
He would have man himself regard, his transit take.
Our fathers parted into head, tail, body, wings,
The verses made to fly to heaven the chanter sings;
And delved, as we their children delve, bird-shaped, with head
And body wings and tail smoothed-out, the altar-bed,
The space wherein the fires are set wherein we pour
Libations to delight the gods whom we adore;
Where, gods thus first supplied, partake we too
High festival with them, all seated on the strew.]

Praise of Food.

From food forsooth are brought to birth
All growths that find support on earth;
By food thenceforth they live and then

Food they become at last again.
So, chief is food of beings all,
And that explains why it we call
"The Universal Nourishment."

All who adore, in worship bent,
Spirit as food, all food obtain.
Again doth that the mot explain—
"The Universal Nourishment."

From food are beings born; 't is so.
By means of food, when born, they grow.
Food both is eaten and doth eat,
Hence we it '**Aunam**!' ['Eatin'!'] greet.

2. The Second Form: Made of Breath.

The Head: Breath (**prāṇa**).
The Right Wing: Diffused Breath (**vyāna**).
The Left Wing: Out-breath (**apāna**).
The Body: Space.
The Tail, the Support: The Earth.

Is This next met not such as eyes can view,
Or hands can grasp, yet ranged as person too—
The Self of Breath composed. By This is filled
The Self that doth of Food its members build;
And as That person doth his structure frame,
So models This with spirants form the same,
Drawn in, sent out, urged round within: his head—
'The breath'; the wing on right, its currents sped
With strength—'the breath diffused'; the wing on left-
'The out-breath'; 'space'—his body, where are weft,
Within, without, all airs with changeful tide;
And for his grand support—'the earth' so wide.

Praise of Breath.

O great is Breath! Close following after Breath
[For service that to them it rendereth]
The gods do breathe; men also breath ensue
Remittingless; and leashed are beasts thereto.
Breath is indeed the life that beings live,
Whence 'Life-of-all' the name to it we give.

All they to life their way complete do make
Who Spirit do as Breath for worship take.

Such the embodied Self that Breath doth hold,
Like unto that which hath of Food been told.

3. The Third Form: Made of the Covetous Mind in the Heart.

The Head: The Veda of Sacrifice (The Yajur-Veda).
The Right Wing: The Veda of Hymns (The Rig-Veda).
The Left Wing: The Veda of Chants (The Sāma-Veda).
The Body: The Teaching (**ādeśa**).
The Tail, the Support: The Collection of Spells (Atharvāngirasas).

Other than Self construct of Breath next find,
Framed in the heart, the Self of avid mind
By which is gain desired, thought out, and willed.
As That, so This doth form of person build,
The Yajur-Veda, sacred lore expressed
In potent formulae to gods addressed,
'Veda of Sacrifice' hence fitly named—
His head; the Veda out of which are framed
These formulae, the Veda we recite,
Rig-Veda (Verses-Veda)—wing on right;
The Sāma-Veda, that Rig-Veda weft
With chantings' regulating beat—wing left;
His body—'Teaching' how these things be done,
For woe betide, be slip incurred but one.
And, lo! th' Átharvāngirasas hymns,
Composed of Spells, make *that* man's lower limbs.

[Yet declamation, incantation, chant
That seek to grasp from gods the goods we want
Grasp not our want. That that indeed is so
The stanza which we now do quote doth show.]

The Failure of the Covetous Mind.

Voices of such Mind, pursuant on their track,
Not catching That, from It, dismayed, turn back;
But him, who bliss of Spirit knows, appal
No turning-fears at any time at all!

As of the former, Breath, has just been told,
We here see Mind a bodily self unfold.

4. THE FOURTH FORM: MADE OF PURE INTELLIGENCE (**vijnāna**).

The Head: Faith (**śraddhā**).
The Right Wing: What is right (**ṛta**).
The Left Wing: What is true (**satya**).
The Body: Meditation (**yoga**).
The Tail, the Support: Might (**mahas**).

The Self of pure Intelligence mark next
With no desire of acquisition vexed.
By This that Self of avid Mind is filled.
Doth This like That in form of person build,
And as the heart-bound Mind its mould doth frame,
So This one portions-out his form the same.
His head is 'faith'; his right wing—'what is right';
Left—'what is true'; the body of his flight
Is 'meditation,' by which his form is set
On 'might,' for, great his height, is yet
His station strong.

[The following verse doth raise
Keen-eyed, high-placed, Intelligence's praise:]

IN PRAISE OF INTELLIGENCE.

'T is by Intelligence that movements deft
At holy sacrifice are duly weft.
Sooth, all the deeds we plan and do and dare
Intelligence doth weave us strong and fair.
Yea, worship all the gods Intelligence
As Spirit, chief, with deepest reverence.

If Spirit as Intelligence one knows
Nor with it idly plays as on he goes,
His sins he in the body leaves; desires,
Yea, all the train, flesh left behind, acquires.

So see we here as hath of Mind been told,
Intelligence a bodily self unfold.

5. The Fifth Form: Made of Bliss.

The Head: Pleasure (**priya**).
The Right Wing: Delight (**moda**).
The Left Wing: Great delight (**pra-moda**).
The Body: Bliss (**ānanda**).
The Tail, the Support: Spirit (**brahman**).

Other than That one just described is This—
The Self within it that is made of Bliss.
By This Intelligence's form is filled.
Doth This like That in shape of person build,
For, as Intelligence his mould doth frame,
So This one doth dispose himself the same.
His head is 'pleasure'; '**moda**'—wing on right,
'Delight'; '**pramoda**' wing on left endite
[**Moda** plus **pra**, so—'great delight,' the **pra**,[1]
Which meaneth 'forth,' denoting no delay,
But joy that dances 'forth' upon its way].
Person indeed of highest pleasance—This;
His body, source and store of strength, is 'bliss'
With 'Spirit' his support, which with its spell
Doth make the heart receiving it to swell.

IV. IDENTITY WITH THE SUN.

This Person and That Person in the Sun,
This within and That above, are one.
He that the truth of This doth know,
On death doth to That Person go.
Recount his progress rising so:

V. RECAPITULATION OF THE RETURN.

At first doth he the Self of Food construct;
Doth next in Self of Breath his powers conduct;
In Self, that doth with avid Mind conceive,
Back nearer home doth next his way retrieve;
Then ousts that Self to avarice propense
With glorious Self of pure Intelligence;
Then, still advancing, joyous, past all this,
Attains, at Sun, his goal, the Self of Bliss.

[1] **prá**, *prep.* forward, onward, forth, fore [cf. Gk. and Lat. *pro*, before]. [L.]

He, Self of all, then through these worlds at ease
Saunters, here, there—eating what food he please;
And O! the forms he dotes upon
Just these at will he putteth on,
Then sits and sings
Mid myriad rings:

VI. THE RAPTUROUS SONG OF THE WORLD-SOUL, THE UNITIVE SELF, AFTER IT HAS RETURNED TO ITSELF.

"O, wonderful! O, wonderful! O, wonderful!
Food am I! Food am I! Food am I!
Fare for these realms of earth and sky.
Food-eater too! Food-eater too! Food-eater too!
I absorb them with joy as I pass through.
I am maker of songs, of paeans, of fanfares far,
That sink neath the depth and o'ermount the star!
O, hear them course round!
By Me, held in awe,
Are all vagaries bound,
For I am the first-born of Law.
Before the gods were brought forth was I
In the navel of immortality.
He who gives me away
Me doth save from decay.
I am food, and the eater of food I eat.
All that exists is beneath my feet,
I the light in its beauty that all things greet."

4

MACROCOSM AND MICROCOSM:

From the Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

Macrocosm and Microcosm

'**Bhūḥ**! **bhuvaḥ**! **svaḥ**!' our priests do cry,
Invoking thus earth, air, and sky.
Bhūḥ is the 'earth' and **bhuvaḥ** 'air'
And **svaḥ** the 'sun' that shines up there.
Now count the breaths for these we take,
And note that they (when **svaḥ** we make
Dissyllable[1]) one-two-two mete,
Just as we count our head-hands-feet,
For **bhūḥ** makes one, and **bhuv-aḥ su-aḥ**
Each two. Our members thus concur.
So, earth-air-sky and head-hands-feet
Do each a triplet make complete,
Each triplet, note, at root combined,
Their branches also intertwined.
And thus the wondrous truth we reach
That these do answer each to each.
And so should we in earth, air, sky,
A Person's giant form descry,
His portions clearly to us told,
Just as are with this Person found
Together in this body bound.
His head is earth, his arms the air,
His feet the shining sun up there.
Yea, as that sun secure he stands,
The moving breezes are his hands,

[1] That is, as **su-aḥ**.

His head rotund this tree-clothed earth
In which his senses have their birth.
The secret grand by which his way
This Person augurs is the *Day.*
Be That the Person planted high,
The Other moves in this right eye
With head-arms-feet which we know well,
Which one-two-two, we saw, do tell;
To whom then too let none demur
To also cry '**Bhūḥ! bhuvaḥ! svaḥ!**';
Who also holds, whereby he stands
And moveth safely, head feet hands,
A secret, as doth He on high;
And what his secret? It is *I.*

Aham is '*I*' and '*Day*'—**ahan.**
Thus voice doth draw these two toward one,
To show, who would make sure his way
Must jointly reverence '*I*' and '*Day.*'

5

THE OPEN WAY AT DEATH:

From the Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The Open Way at Death

In yonder sun the Real behold,
All gold and throned in orb of gold.
This Person in the right eye placed
And He are each on other based.
See This from That his life-breaths bring,
While That sends rays on This to cling.
When This one here doth come to die
And home his life-breaths yearn to fly,
The Real, these arms withdrawn, shines clear;
Nought with return doth interfere.

6

THE CREED OF ŚĀṆḌILYA

WHICH IS FOUND IN

The Secret Teaching in the Chant

AND

A SONG BY PAUL EBERHARDT BASED UPON THE CREED

The Creed of Śāṇḍilya[1]

1. Verily this whole world is Spirit. Tranquil, let one worship It as that from which he came forth, as that into which he will be dissolved, as that in which he breathes.[2]

Now, verily, the Person consists of purpose (**kratu-maya**). According to the purpose which the Person has in this world, thus does he become on departing hence. So let him form for himself a purpose.

2. He who consists of mind, whose body is life (**prāṇa**), whose form is light, whose conception is truth, whose self [or 'body'] (**ātman**) is space, containing all works, containing all desires, containing all odors, containing all tastes, encompassing this whole world, the unspeaking, the unconcerned—[3] this self of mine within the heart is smaller than a grain of rice, or a barley-corn, or a mustard-seed, or a grain of millet, or a kernel of a grain of millet;

[1] This, which is Chāndogya, 3. 14, and is found in an abbreviated form in BAU., 5.6, occurs also as *Śat. Br.*, 10.6.3.

[2] "as that, etc.," is Śaṁkara's interpretation of the word **tajjalān**, which we find in the text. He derives it from the words **tat**, 'that'; √**jan**, 'produce'; √**lī**, 'slip into,' 'disappear'; √**an**, 'breathe.'

this self of mine within the heart is greater than the earth, greater than the atmosphere, greater than the sky, greater than these worlds.

4. Containing all works, containing all desires, containing all odors, containing all tastes, encompassing this whole world, the unspeaking, the unconcerned—this is the self of mine within the heart, this is Spirit. Into him I shall enter on departing hence.

If one would believe this, he would have no more doubt. Thus used Śāṇḍilya to say; yea, Śāṇḍilya!

A SONG BY PAUL EBERHARDT,[1]

BROUGHT TO ITS VOICE BY THE CREED OF ŚĀṆDILYA.

Soul of mine, how small!
To enclose thy sorrow
Not the flooded mere
Needest thou to borrow—
Just a single tear
Can contain it all;
And thy joys together throng
Fully in a little song.
Soul of mine, how small!

Yet thine anguish piled-up skies—
O how far they seem to rise!—
Vainly struggle to comprise,
And thy jubilation far
Overleaps the highest star.
So, most clear it is to see,
Wondrous great my soul must be.

[1] In *Der Weisheit Letzter Schluss*, p. 61.

7

WHAT CERTAIN CREATURES OF THE WILDERNESS TAUGHT SATYAKĀMA

AND HOW NEVERTHELESS HE SOUGHT INSTRUCTION FROM HIS TEACHER:

From the Secret Teaching in the Chant.

What Certain Creatures of the Wilderness taught Satyakāma

AND HOW NEVERTHELESS HE SOUGHT INSTRUCTION FROM HIS TEACHER.

Satyakāma is received as Pupil by Hāridrúmata.

Satyakāma (Lover of Truth)[1]
His mother thus addressed:
"Madam, I would in this my youth
A student be professed

Of sacred lore, which none may be
Save Brahmins. Tell me pray
My family." "That, to me
Not known, I cannot say"

Replied Jabāla. "In my youth
In service much about,
Satyakāma, Lover of Truth,
I got thee. So give out

[1] That is the translation of 'Satya-kāma.'

'Satyakāma' be thy name
'Jabāla's son'." At that,
To where a sage of teaching-fame,
Hāridrúmata, sat,

Of Gotama's lineage, went
The youth. "To learn," said he,
"The sacred lore my steps are bent.
May I thy pupil be?"

At which the sage: "Make known, I pray,
Thy rank by birth, my dear."
The youth replied, "I cannot say.
I come from questioning clear

My mother, and she said 'In youth,
When serving much about,
Satyakāma, Lover of Truth,
I got thee. So give out

'Satyakāma' be thy name,
'Jabāla's son'." Whereat
The sage: "Alone could Brahmin frame
An answer clear like that.

The fuel take in hand, my dear,
To light my fire and live with me
As pupil. 'Not to veer
From truth' inspireth thee."

The First Act of Hāridrúmata after installing Satyakāma was not to teach him but to send him into the Wilderness to tend his cows.

The sage received him, from the kine
Four hundred weak and lean
Chose out: "My dear, these cows of mine
Now tend." For one aim keen—

To be obedient—straight he cried:
"Your reverence, to thee
I will not back, till multiplied
These cows to thousand be."

THE QUARTERS OF THE SPIRIT.

I. The Bull's Announcement of the Quarter 'Conspicuous.'

So Satyakāma stayed away
Through many years, saw make
The herd its thousand, on which day
At last the mystery brake.

The Bull said "Satyakāma!" "Sir!"
Attentive he replied.
"Us now a thousand, dear, bestir
To reach where doth reside

The teacher. Now would I to thee
A fourth of Spirit tell."
"So let his honour speak," said he,
And thus the Bull's words fell:—

"The east the west the south the north,
A sixteenth each one, frame
A Spirit-quarter shining forth,
'Conspicuous' its name.

He who this quarter, known it thus,
In reverence maintains,
Becometh here conspicuous
And worlds conspicuous gains.

The Fire a quarter will proclaim."

II. The Fire's Announcement of the Quarter 'Endless.'

So drove he forth next day
The herd, and where at eve they came
Made halt for night to stay.

A fire he lit and round the cows
He wove a circling pen,
Then on the fire more broken boughs
As fuel set, and then

Did, facing east with ne'er a stir,
West of the Fire ensconce,
Which whispered "Satyakāma!" "Sir"
Said he in quick response.

Whereat the Fire said "Would I thee
A fourth of Spirit tell."
"So let his honour speak," said he,
And thus the Fire's words fell:

"A sixteenth each, earth, air, sky, cloud
Returning whence it came,
Quarter of Spirit's mystery shroud,
'The Endless' is its name.

He who this quarter, known it thus,
In reverence maintains,
Becomes here aye continuous
And endless worlds he gains."

The Swan a quarter will proclaim.

III. The Swan's Announcement of the Quarter 'Luminous.'

At morn, resumed his way,
He made again, when evening came,
A halt for night to stay.

The fire he lighted, round the cows
Entwined a circling pen;
Built up the fire with broken boughs
And set him eastward; then

The Swan flew down, wings all astir,
And "Satyakāma!" cried,
To which the youth, respectful, "Sir,"
Expectantly replied.

Then cried the Swan "Would I to thee
A fourth of Spirit tell."
"So let his honour speak," said he,
And thus the Swan's words fell:

"The fire, the sun, the morn, the glare
Called 'Lightning,' quarter frame,
A sixteenth each; since light these bear,
'The luminous' its name.

He who this quarter, known it thus,
In reverence maintains.
Becomes in this world luminous,
Worlds luminous he gains."

A fourth the Diver will proclaim.

IV. The Diver-Bird's Announcement of the Quarter 'Supported.'

The cows again next day
He drove, and where at eve they came
Made halt for night to stay.

A fire he lit and fenced the cows
Within enclosing pen,
More fuel laid of broken boughs,
Sat eastward facing; then

The Diver-bird, wings all astir,
Alighted by his side
With "Satyakāma!" Quoth he "Sir!"
And heedful did abide.

Then cried the Diver "I would thee
A fourth of Spirit tell."
"So let his honour speak," said he,
And these the words that fell:

"The breath, the eye, the ear, the mind,
A Spirit-quarter frame;
Support these sixteen parts each find;
'Supported' thus its name.

He who this quarter, known it thus,
In reverence maintains,
Supported in this world becomes,
And worlds supported gains."

Satyakāma returns.

The teacher cried to him arrived,
"My dear, I see thee shine
Like Spirit-knower. Whence derived
The knowledge that is thine?"

Satyakāma asks his teacher to instruct him.

"From men I learned not, yet to me
Instruction give I pray,
For I have heard, from those like thee,
Who seeks upon this way

Knowledge most fit to gain the goal,
From teachers gathers it."

The Teacher now tells him the secret and tells it fully.

Then told the sage to him the whole,
Yea, kept not back a whit.

8

HOW SPIRIT BECAME THE ALL

From the Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest

How Spirit became the All

We find this asked: "Knowledge of Spirit is
The means by which men think they will the All
Become. What was it then that Spirit knew,
Whereby it did the all become?"

To that
We thus reply: Spirit indeed this world
At the beginning was. Behold, it knew
Itself as self. So, Spirit being, it
Could then itself address: "I that am I,
I Spirit am." Thereby it did the All
Become.

Whoever of the gods (be it
The God of Storm, the Sun, or other god)
To that awoke, the All became. So too
The seers, so also—men. Perceiving that,
To this the seer Vāmadeva came:
"Manu, the first of all mankind, was I.
So too, 't is I that shines as Sun."

The same
Likewise to-day doth hold. The man who knows
"I Spirit am," the All doth he become.
Even the gods possess no power that he
Should not be so, for he thereby their self
Becomes.

The man who thinks "He yonder there
Is one and I another," and so comes
Other divinity to worship than
The Self, this knowledge hath not yet attained.
A beast domestic of the gods is he,
To service bound. And mark, as many beasts
With men are each one reckoned in, with gods
Each single man. Be from the herd but one
Withdrawn is found unpleasant. What say then,
If many? So, not what they like it is,
That human beings this should come to know.

9

THE SELF CREATIVE

From the Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest

The Self Creative

This world in the beginning was the Self,
In person's form disposed, nought else than he.
He thus bestirred:

As forest-dweller who,
Spinning a twig within his hands, a spark
Doth draw from out a white-bleached stock, long lain
A relict of o'erspreading boughs, that, smote
By many searching suns, hath tinderous
Become, and blows the spark to flame: so he.
Unto his mouth he raised his hands. [With that
The teacher raised his hands to show in act
The marvel told.] He, churning with his lips—
Lips that are twain as twain the drill-stick and
The mother-stock—did breathe out fire. His mouth
Whereby the Spirit did itself express
(Keep thou in mind the Hymns of praise and prayer
The Spirit moved our poets to recite,
Which, they aver, they heard from heaven, used now
In our devotions at the sacrifice)
Did thus become, e'en that his mouth, the womb
Wherefrom he brought this world to light, And so
We find in that his kindling act of old
These three together linked that testify
To-day to that primeval partnership
By being smooth alike within: the mouth,
The hands, and that dark place of origin
From which we all proceed.

So, recognise
All moisture, be it rain at whose descent
The food doth break forth from the ground, or sap
Of trees that into leaves and buds doth burst,
Or lymph that burgeons into teeming life,
As one great effluence sent forth from him,
Yea, as in truth that Soma stream which from
The stalks we crush in solemn act doth flow,
The while we join in holy sacrifice,
Which doth in those who quaff awaken thought
And speech and them immortal make and leads
Them into light so that they come the gods
To know.

Mark next. Thus much is this whole world:
Just food and that which eateth food, these two,
Eaten and eater. Food is Soma. That
Which eats is fire, the glow forsooth we feel
Within, which with digestive power the food
We take consumes.

So knew he: "It is I
Who this creation am, for from myself
I sent it forth, e'en all I now behold."
Thence it was that this creation came
To be. Who knows this comes indeed to be
In this creation that is his.

Yet more
To tell! What of the gods? We hear folk say
"Worship this god and that god," singling out
First one and then another. Natheless these
Are from himself. He it is is all
The gods. And that the Spirit's, mark thou,
Super-creation is. So called because
More fair and glorious than himself are these,
E'en gods, that from himself he hath evolved.
He, mortal, hath immortals brought him forth,
Super-creation therefore truly called.
In that creation which, while his, doth him
Surpass, the man who knows this comes to be.

10

THE INSTRUCTION GIVEN BY UDDĀLAKA ĀRUṆEYA TO HIS SON SVETAKETU

From the Secret Teaching in the Chant.

The Instruction given by Uddālaka Āruṇeya to his son Svetaketu

UDDĀLAKA BIDS HIS SON ENGAGE IN SACRED STUDY.

Uddālaka did Śvetaketu bid
Engage in sacred study, for, said he,
"Among our family is none who is
Unlearnèd in the Vedas, in Brahminhood
By kinship, as it were."

THE PRIDE OF THE GRADUATE.

When so
Had Śvetaketu at the age of twelve
Become a pupil in the sacred lore
And all the Vedas learned, he then, at age
Of four and twenty, to his home returned,
Possessed of mighty mind, deeming himself
A learnèd man, and in his bearing stiff.

THE FATHER'S QUESTION.

Of which observant, said Uddālaka:
"My dear, thou hast with mighty mind returned,
Deeming thyself a learnèd man, and stiff
In bearing. Means this thou didst also ask
That teaching to be given thee whereby
That which hath not been heard of meets the ear,
That which hath not been thought of enters thought,
That not as yet discerned becomes discerned?"

ŚVETAKETU HAS TO CONFESS HIS IGNORANCE.

To this could Śvetaketu but reply:
"What pray, Sir, is that teaching?"

ALL SEPARATION IS SIMPLY PUTTING A NAME.

Thus addressed,
His father said: "Just as by but one lump
Of clay, my dear, may all that is of clay
Be understood, or by one ornament
Of copper everything of copper known,
Or apprehended by one nail-scissors all
That is of iron: so that teaching is.

First, take a lump of clay. We call it 'lump,'
As separate in itself regard,
But only in our 'calling' is it so;
The separation is a taking hold
By voice, yea nothing more, nought else
Than putting of a name; the truth is clay.
Consider next the copper 'ornament.'
It seems to us existent in itself,
Yet here again the separation that
We make is just a capture by the voice,
The putting of a name; the truth this time
Is copper. Let us next the 'scissors' take.
The separation, here again assumed,
Is nothing but a seizing by the voice,
A name we put; the truth, reality,
Here met is simply iron."

ŚVETAKETU BEGS TO BE INSTRUCTED.

"Verily,"
Said Śvetaketu. "This those honoured men
Who taught me did not know for had they known
Why should they not have told me? But do thou,
Sir, tell it me." "My dear, so be it," said
Uddālaka, and thus he spake:—

ONLY BEING IN THE BEGINNING.

"Know then
That *simply Being, simply One, and so*
Without a second, was this world at first.
In contrary indeed some people say
'Non-being simply, only One, and so
Without a second, was this world at first,
And so did Being come to be.' But how
Could Being from Non-being issue forth?
Not so! In the beginning Being was,
Just Being, One, without a second."

THE PRODUCTION FROM BEING OF HEAT, WATER, FOOD AS CONSTITUENTS OF THE WORLD.

"It
Bethought itself 'May I be many, bring
Forth progeny!' [Doth not a person so
Desire, himself beholding only One
Without a second? And in that which is
Just Being, with no second, only One,
Is not the many just in thought thereon
Involved?] With that did Heat arise. Then Heat
Bethought itself 'May I be many!' Then
The Waters did ensue. [Observe thou, when
A person grieves or doth exert himself,
His heat engenders water; tears are shed
And sweat comes forth.] The Waters then bethought
Themselves 'One flood we be, we also would
Be many.' From out the Waters Food then rose.
[Note thou how food springs up when rain sinks in.]

So these compose the world: first, Heat, that is
To say, all warmth, wherever warmth be found;
The Waters—that is all that liquid is,
The fluids coursing through our frame, the clouds,
All moisture, life's elixir multiplex;
And Food, that is, all solid, due some time
To meet its eater, he who eats thereof
By it, his food, in turn to eaten be,
For Justice so requires."

BEING, ENTERING AS INDIVIDUAL SOUL INTO THESE CONSTITUENTS OF THE WORLD, FASHIONS OUT NAME AND FORM.

"But note that now—
And how momentous this did prove!—did that
Divinity bethink itself, aware
Of lack in these divinities, these three,
Heat, Water, Food, of which had heat
And water sent their products out, each at
Its own initiative from out themselves
Apart from Being's aid: 'Come, let me, with
This living self, an entrant I, within
These three divinities, in them at home,
Them permeating, make out Name and Form.' "

THE TRANSFORMATION ('RED,' 'WHITE' AND 'BLACK') EFFECTED BY NAME AND FORM UPON THE THREE CONSTITUENTS OF THE WORLD (HEAT, WATER, FOOD)

"Thus Being Name and Form did fashion out,
When with this living soul It came to dwell,
Active inhabitant, within this world
Of heat and lymph and food, a world ere that unnamed,
Possessed of nothing in itself discrete.
Contrást with that unpunctuated state
The gladsome change when Being, One, without
A second, entered thus, to dwell herein
Active inhabitant, and set him up
To be the joint assessors of his rule.
These 'goblins' twain, yclept so by our sires,
E'en Name that puts the Form (that is the shape
Mark, colour, impress, whatsoe'er it be,
Upon the sense or mind), and Form that doth
Embody Name; for, master-wizards they,
By names they have bestowed upon Heat, Lymph,
And Food, the forms that constitute the world,
Heat styling 'red,' the Waters—'white,' Food—'black,'
Have wrought with potent magic on our sense,
For as the 'lump' of clay, the copper 'ornament,'
The 'scissors' made of iron, were indeed
Found nothing else than strictures by the voice,

Mere puttings of a name, the truth of each—
Clay, copper, iron; so it also is
With 'red' and 'white' and 'black.' These three are each
Nought else than takings-hold by voice, are but
The puttings of a name, the truth is one
Of these three forms, Heat, Water, Food. Where name
Of 'red' is given, there is Heat; where 'white'—
The Waters are; where 'black'—is Food."

EXAMPLES OF THESE THREE NAMES, 'RED,' 'WHITE,' 'BLACK,' AS THEY ARE GIVEN TO CERTAIN POWERS THAT SHINE, WHICH POWERS, BEING THUS SHOWN TO BE NOTHING ELSE THAN COMPOSITES OF THE THREE FORMS THAT CONSTITUTE THE WORLD, LOSE THEIR INDEPENDENT EXISTENCE.

"Note then
That Being hath these products three that are
Eventual from himself, that do the world
Compose, Heat, Waters, Food, transfigured with
These names of 'red,' 'white,' 'black.' So now observe
How these three elemental forms present
Themselves, each in its own disguise, in these,
Fire, sun, moon, lightning, powers four that shine.

FIRST, THE FIRE.

"First watch the fire advancing in the wood.
It kindles in the form named 'red.' 'Tis Heat
We see. Then 'white' it glows and palpitates.
The Waters (Liquid) it is plainly, that
We now descry. Then with its lowering
Doth 'black,' the char, set in, which certes is
Food (Solid, Earth) presented to our eyes.
So here it is as with the 'lump' of clay of which
We spoke, the 'ornament' of copper, 'pair
Of scissors' made of iron, each of which,
Declared to be a separate thing, was by
Reflection found in truth to simply be
Clay, copper, iron, made of which these are;
Their separate existence nothing more
Than just a capture by the voice, nought else
For each than putting of a name. Here then

The 'red,' 'white,' 'black,' we see are nothing else
Than those three forms that constitute the world,
Heat, Water, Food. *The firehood from the fire*
Hath gone."

SECOND, THE SUN.

"Next watch the sun. It riseth 'red,'
Whatever 'red' it hath is form of Heat.
Ascending, it becometh 'white,' more 'white,'
A pool that seetheth to the brim. Are not
The Waters (Liquid) plainly there? From height
Descending, next it waxeth 'black.' Is not
Food (Solid, Earth) as plain now here to see?
So 'red,' 'white,' 'black,' are only graspings by
The voice, nought else than putting of these names;
The truth, reality, is just these three
That constitute the world. *And so hath gone*
The sunhood from the sun."

THIRD, THE MOON.

"The moon next view.
Perchance it riseth red. See 'white' set in,
As if into a goblet deftly held
On high 't were slowly poured, until all 'white'
It shines, and then as slowly wane, as if
From that high held-up goblet white again
At the same measure were oblate; what but
The waters teeming in and filling up
And passing out again? And when these out
Have gone, all 'black' we see. Plainly 't is Food
(Earth, Solid) come to view. So 'red,' 'white,' 'black'
Are nought but seizings made by voice,
Just putting of these names; the truth we see
Is just Heat, Waters, Food. *And so hath gone*
The moonhood from the moon."

FOURTH, THE LIGHTNING.

"Alert, next watch
Break-in the lightning, unexpected when,
Whence, whither. Ho! the 'red'! What else but Heat?

Next see the fans of 'white' that open out
Across the sky, as might a river, loosed
On sudden from the hills, o'erflood the plain;
And jets of 'white,' the flying life-sap launch:
The Waters! Note the 'black' where down the tree
The dazzling 'white' has travelled; what that but
Food (Earth, the Solid)? Here again are 'red'
'White,' 'black' but captures by the voice, no more
Than putting of these names; the truth is just
Heat, Waters, Food. These three constituents
That make the world are the reality.
The lightning-hood hath from the lightning gone.

"In sooth just this the great householders versed
In sacred lore did know when thus of old
They claimed: 'No one may now bring up to us
That which hath never met our ear, our thought
Hath never entered, never hath by us
Been understood,' for they from these three forms
Knew everything. Whatever 'red' appeared
They knew was form of Heat, whatever 'white'
The form pronounced upon the Waters, 'dark,'
Wherever seen, the form of Food. And thus
What did un-understood appear they knew
A combination just to be of just
These three divinities."

THE NAMES AND FORMS OF THE WORLD-FORMS IN THEIR GRASP UPON THE PERSON.

"And now, my dear,"
Uddālaka continued, "understand
From me, in what conditions each of these
Divinities, Heat, Waters, Food, that form
The world, are found when, reaching forward, they
Have seized upon the person; three the names
And forms on each pronounced—coarse, medium, fine—
Three sortings.

"So, my dear, the passage note
From coarse to fine from dense to subtle, just
As with coagulated milk, when churned,

Doth all that finest essence is ascend
And make itself above the thickened curd
A crown of shining lambent butter, fit
To pour upon the leaping altar flames,
That these may, eager carriers, bear it up
To feed the gods.

"Mark then of Food
When eaten, three constituents—the coarse,
The excrement, its riddance gladly made;
The medium, next, the flesh, the tender wrap
That clothes the bones; the next and innermost,
And so from grasp of these divinities
That seize upon the person most removed,
The fine, the mind, that in the heart with glow
And thought and purpose doth bestir.

"Next note
The Waters. See how they, when drunk, become
Apportioned; first, the coarse, a noisome thing,
And so, set in the bilge for riddance; next
The medium that doth surge the heart within,
A tide of warming crimson; next, the fine,
The breath, of texture rare indeed, that sends
Beneficent its various winding spires
Throughout our frame.

"So too doth Heat become,
When eaten, three: the first part coarsest, bone;
The next, the medium, marrow; then—the fine,
The voice.

"For know, although not manifest
Are these, the mind is made of Food, the breath—
Of Waters, voice—of Heat.

"And so again,
Is separation nothing else discerned
To be than pendant simply on the voice
The putting merely of a name; the truth,

Reality, of these is these three forms,
Heat, Waters, Food, that did in sequence come
From Being, when it did bethink itself
'O let me many be,' and now compose
The whole wide world we see."

"O sir, do thou,
Who with this doctrine so enlightenest me,
Cause me to understand yet more."

"My dear,
So let it be," Uddālaka replied.

The Further Enlightenment of Śvetaketu.

But not by mere description did he next
His son instruct, but by experiment
By means of which he showed a person doth
Of sixteen parts consist; and then did he
On sleep hunger and thirst discourse; and then
Detailed what happens when a person dies.

What happens when a person dies.

"When here a person is deceasing, goes
His voice into his mind," my dear; "his mind—
Into his breath; his breath then into heat;
Then into the highest divinity
The heat proceeds.

"Thus into that
Divinity, e'en Being, do return
Food, Water, Heat successively in these
Three forms refined, now named mind, breath, and heat.
A threefold devolute, each into that
Reverting out of which it did proceed,
When these, a threefold evolute, did out
Of Being rise, when it bethought itself
'O may I many be' and thus produced
The world."

THE SECRET ANNOUNCED.

The Secret then the sage disclosed:

That which is the finest essence: That which hath
that Essence as its soul this whole world is;
That the Real is, That—the Self;
That art thou, O Śvetaketu.

At that in Śvetaketu stirred
A strange expectancy, but yet he felt
His heart's door closed.
"O Sir," said he, "just more
Make me to understand."
"So let it be,
My dear," his father said, and then did these
Enigmas following now put forth, that they,
The secret holding or to serve it bent,
Might waken wonder, and that wonder, roused,
Might at his heart's door knock, and so his mind,
By wonder made alert, might forward step,
And ope the door and let the secret in.

RIDDLES OF BEING.

THE FIRST RIDDLE: THE TREES AND THE HONEY.

"O Śvetaketu, lift thine eyes! The tree-tops hold in view!
See how the trees their flowering there display against the blue—
Mark dazzling white, mark scarlet like a flame—
Thus holding up
Within each cup
The essence of each mighty leaf-clothed frame!

But list, O Śvetaketu, to the murmur of the bees!
What do they in the sunshine that is beating on the trees?
These juices making run
All to a honey one;
So, none of these proud trees can say, arrived that honey at,
'Behold, this tree so great am I!' 'And I, behold, am that!'
Just so, my dear,
All offsprings here,

That in deep sleep, or at their dying, into Being go,
Do not, though Being they have reached, 'We have reached Being' know.

And tiger, lion, wolf, boar, worm, gnat, mosquito with its hum,
Whatever in this world they be, they That again become.

Now then, to this I said apply thy mind:

That which is the finest essence: That which hath that Essence as its soul this whole world is;
That the Real is, That—the Self;
That art Thou, O Śvetaketu."

"O Sir, make me just more to understand," said he.
To which his father did reply "So let it be."

THE SECOND RIDDLE: THE RIVERS AND THE GATHERED WATERS.

"Behold the eastern rivers, dear, how swiftly east they go
The western next, how strongly they to opposite do flow!
Come from the gathered Waters all these streams, howe'er diverse
The paths be ta'en
By which they speed, into the gathered waters to immerse
Themselves again;
Yea, just those very gathered waters they become to which they hie,
Therein to know not 'I this mighty river am,' 'That river—I.'

Just so, my dear,
All offsprings here,
Although, when out of dreamless sleep they wake or born they be,
From Being do arrive, yet know not they 'Arrived from Being we.'

And tiger, lion, wolf, boar, worm, gnat, mosquito with its hum.
Whatever in this world they be, they That again become,

That which is the finest essence: That which hath that Essence as its soul this whole world is;
That the Real is; That—the Self;
Thou art Thou, O Śvetaketu."

"O Sir, make me just more to understand," said he.
To which his father did reply "So let it be."

THE THIRD RIDDLE: THE TREE.

"If one upon this tree—root midst or top—a blow should give,
There, at that point, the tree should bleed, but yet the tree would live,
For in the Self, shown in the whole, the tree doth stand alive,
Rejoicing, moisture drinking in, and all its good derive.
And, if the life doth leave one branch, that branch doth wither quite,
A second left and then a third, each perishes outright,
Yet not the tree: but, if such fate the whole should come upon,
Which is the Self's embodiment, we say 'The tree is gone!'
The form doth linger. True! But network bleached and gaunt
Without the Self is not adept the tree to be to vaunt.
The life that as the Self doth move did make that form the tree;
Life gone, no more—the tree, although as erst the form may be.
Life gone, yet say not 'perished life.' The form by life is left
And perish shall—so too this body when of life bereft—
But life is more than that which meets the eye
And life as life shall never die.
That which is the finest essence: That which hath that Essence as its soul this whole world is;
That the real is; That—the Self;
That art Thou, O Śvetaketu.

"O Sir, make me just more to understand," said he.
To which his father did reply, "So let it be."

THE FOURTH RIDDLE: THE SEED OF THE NY-AG-RODHA BERRY.

"Our Fig-tree's scarlet berry now bring me."
"'Tis here," "Divide it." "Now, what dost thou see?"
"These fine deposits, as it were." "Of these
Fine seeds now split but one, and tell me, please,

What thou dost see." "Not anything," said he.
"That finest essence not perceived by thee,
In sooth from that ariseth this [his hand
The teacher upward swept] with height so grand,
With vast outspreading dark-leaved crown,
That sends all round its tendrils down
And doth with stems fetched-up comprise
Well-nigh a forest to thine eyes,
The **ny-ag-rodha** tree! Believe
Me then, my dear. The truth receive.

That which is the finest essence: That which hath that Essence as its soul this whole world is;
That the Real is; that—the Self;
That are Thou, O Śvetaketu."

"O Sir, make me just more to understand," said he.
To which his father did reply "So let it be."

THE FIFTH RIDDLE: THE SALT IN THE WATER.

"Into the water put this salt," said he,
And in the morning come, my dear, to me.
He did as told. His father then did say
"The salt thou placedst over-night, I pray,
Now bring to me." To grasp it then he sought,
But not a grain could to his touch be brought;
Completely was the salt dissolved. "A sip
From this end take; how is it?" "Salt." "Now dip
In midst thy finger. There how doth it taste?"
"There too 'tis salt." "The far end next be traced;
How tastes it there?" "Salt, too." "More salt now cast
And come again." "How now?" "Just as the last.
'Tis salt, yea salter. Always is it so."
"Just as thy grasp and sight—this therefore know—
The salt thou castedst in did not retrieve,
So, sooth, thou dost not Being here perceive;
Yet that the salt is present taste makes clear;
So verily indeed is Being here.

That which is the finest essence: That which hath that Essence as its soul this whole world is;
That the Real is; That—the Self;
That art Thou, O Śvetaketu."

"O Sir, make me just more to understand," said he.
To which his father did reply "So let it be."

The Sixth Riddle: The Blind-folded Foreigner on the Windswept Plain.

"It is, my dear, as if one did this story tell:
'Suppose to some wild spot where no man dared to dwell
One led away, with eyes close bandaged, pinioned fast,
A man of the Gandhāras; there, to every blast
That swept across, abandoned him, left there to go
To east or north or south just as the wind might blow;
And one should come and tear the bandage from his eyes
And set him free and say "In that direction lies
The land of the Gandhāras. Holding that, walk on!"
Would he, village to village he should come upon
Inquisite of his way, upon that line contrive,
Learned were he and wise, and home indeed arrive.'
Even so, caught in the cyclone that here ever blows,
(Pushed this way, that) a person with a teacher knows
'Shall this, for just so long as unreleased I be,
Entoil me. Once set free, arrival sure for me!'

That which is the finest essence: That which hath
that Essence as its soul this whole world is;
That the Real is; That—the Self;
That art Thou, O Śvetaketu."

"O Sir, make me just more to understand," said he.
To which his father did reply "So let it be."

The Seventh Riddle: The Kernel of Consciousness.

"View now, my dear, the sick man taken sore to task,
Death nigh. His kinsmen, one and other, round him ask
'Me dost thou know?' 'Dost thou know me?' That man doth know
So long as not his voice into his mind doth go,
Into his breath his mind, his breath then into heat,
Heat the highest divinity into. But mete
That course its way (when voice doth into mind retire,

Mind into breath, breath into heat (a sinking fire!),
Heat the highest divinity into): come so
The inner man to be, then ceaseth he to know.

That which is the finest essence: That which hath
that Essence as its soul this whole world is;
That the Real is; That—the Self;
That art Thou, O Śvetaketu."

"O Sir, make me just more to understand" said he.
To which his father did reply "So let it be."

Eighth Riddle: The Invisible Protection in Life's Ordeal.

"This also. They lead up, seized by the hand, a man;
Call 'He hath robbed; a theft committed!' Natheless they can
No proof adduce. The deed they name he doth deny.
So 'Heat the ax. Let that him test!' they cry.
Now note, if he in verity the deed did do,
He hath by his denial made himself untrue,
Thus making with untruth himself identified,
Untruth as covert taking, within which to hide.
Fallacious trust! The heated ax by him is ta'en
And he is burned therewith, and presently is slain.
But if that man the deed accused of did not do,
Then by his protest he himself now maketh true,
And, he himself thus with the truth identified,
Within his covert, truth, he doth secure abide.
That man the heated ax doth grasp, but not burned he,
And so not led to slaughter, but forthwith set free.

As did that man, made one with truth, continue whole,
Its course this world, with That, e'en Truth, its soul
And finest essence, holds unbreakably secure.
'T is truth alone that matters. Nothing else is sure.
With truth around thee wrapped, thou shalt thyself maintain
Through life's unceasing ordeal; untruth-clad, be slain.
Know then Thyself and Truth to be identical.
That is the secret. Nothing then appal thee shall.

That which is the finest essence: That which hath
that Essence as its soul this whole world is;
That the Real is; That—the Self:
That art Thou, O Śvetaketu."

THE SECRET REALISED.

'T was now perchance the lighted countenance to him came,
That won for Śvetaketu (Radiance White) his name
(Or had erst hope or portent bade that name bestow?),
For now did shine from him, we may surmise, the glow
Of Spirit-Knower. Fled at this his doubtful mood.
We read "he understood him; yea, he understood."

II

THE BIRD OF PARADISE

From The Secret Teaching for the Tonsured
Also found in
The Secret Teaching of the Possessor of the White Mules
and given point to in The Secret Teaching of Maitri

The Bird of Paradise

THE SIGHT OF THE TRANSCENDENT SELF DELIVERS.

THE DISCIPLE QUOTES THE BALLAD.

Here, Sir, is the ballad our seers hand us down
Of the bird in the tree and the bird on its crown.

THE BALLAD.

Two bright-feathered birds clasp close the same tree
And companions fast bound to each other they be.
One eats the sweet fruit, that doting upon;
The other bright bird without eating looks on.

THE DISCIPLE'S COMMENT AND HIS QUESTION.

So This who eats none is on the tree-top
And is quite undisturbed, while That one doth flop
From twig on to twig, with quiver all rife,
On sea-saw forever, afraid of his life;
With wings all a-flutter and twittering voice,
With his constant engagement the delicate choice
Of the dark-purple berries he gulps down like pelf,
Yet satiate ne'er nor content in himself,
Too engrossed to discover that far o'er his head
His Companion is stationed with nothing to dread,

O! so brilliantly gay in sunshine up there
In peace all serene in the far upper air.
Your pupil, O Sir, is anxious to know
What cure there may be for this Person's sad woe.

THE TEACHER'S INTERPRETATION.

O pupil, the lilt on this old poet's tongue
But dissembles with lightness solemnity sung,
That, snatched not by dullards, it meet no surprise,
But be guessed in its hiding by humble and wise;
For this Bird so resplendent on top of the tree,
The Maker Lord Person and Spirit-source He,
The One Bird and only, e'en That set on high,
That can any, in thinking or doing, espy.
Who, then, catcheth sight of that far-away Bird,
The Only that is, is by no ill bestirred,
For that Bird so resplendent on top of the tree
Can be none but himself, yea none other than he.
How then lures in the boscage, and shadows so grim,
And self so distraught?—they are not his nor him;
For *he* is the Bird on that grand station far,
Shaken off good and evil and all that doth jar,
Poised safe above sund'rance, yea, blent into one
The opposites all, howe'er contraire they run.

O blessed the peace of him who here fares
When his is the knowledge this doctrine declares!

12

THE INSTRUCTION YĀJNAVALKYA GAVE TO JANAKA, KING OF THE VIDEHAS

From The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest

The Instruction Yājnavalkya gave to Janaka, King of the Videhas

THE FIRST INSTRUCTION.

THE SAGE'S RESOLVE AND HIS REPENTANCE OF IT.

The Sage approached the King with this in mind:
"I will not speak [these problems to unbind]
Regarding which he talketh overmuch,
[These mysteries 't is not for his proud caste to touch]."
But at the sacrifice, when—morn, noon, eve,
At sun's arrival height and taking leave—
The earthly fire by us with milk is fed
And worshipped, the sage repentant said
"O zealous King, what boon wilt thou I offer thee?"
To which the King: "O Sage, suffice it me
To ask thee questions." "Ask me then," replied
The sage.

THE KING'S QUESTION.

Forthwith the eager monarch cried:
"What is the light of man?"

The Sage by his partial answers draws from the King renewed request for information, which information prepares the King's mind to receive at last the true Answer to the King's Question.

With still in mind
His first resolve an answer much confined
The sage returned, "The sun, O King. Thereby

Sits man moves round and works and home doth hie."
Whereat the King again inquired: "But when
The sun hath gone, O sage, what lights man then?"
"The moon, O King, is man's light then. Thereby
He sits moves round and works and home doth hie."
But yet again, the King: "O Yājnavalkya, when
The sun and moon have gone, what lights man then?"
"The fire, O King, then lighteth man. Thereby
He sits moves round and works and home doth hie."
"But tell me, sage," said Janaka again,
"The sun and moon retired, fire out, what then
Is light of man?" "Speech is his light, O King;
For, sight he not his hand, let voice then ring,
To whence it comes his footsteps he doth guide."
But yet the King did not content abide.
"O sage, when sun and moon withdraw and when
The fire is still, voice hushed," cried he, "what then
Is light of man?" "The Self, O King. Thereby
He sits moves round and works and home doth hie."

THE SECOND INSTRUCTION.

The King's Further Question.

"Which Self is this?" asked, yet unsatisfied,
The King.

The To-and-Fro Movement of the Intelligential Self.

"This person here," the sage replied,
"Among the senses"—at this on breast he laid
His hand—"who of intelligence is made,
The light within the heart, that same doth keep
Through alternating wake and sleep;
In touch with both this world and that beyond,
Doth move along, deeming himself in bond
Of change to be. So when to sleep he falls
Deflecteth he from this sad world that palls
With forms of death. Thou wilt confess that he,
As born and thus with body come to be,
Hath joined him with tumultuous ills, and when,
At dying, out he steps, he leaveth then
These ills behind. Yet now in touch he keeps
With both these worlds. The border where he sleeps

Is marge of both, so when in sleep he stands
He prospect over both these worlds commands,
With steps this side or that doth take in view
The joys of that world, this world's evils too."

THE CONDITION OF DREAMING.

"So, when from wake to sleep he crossing makes,
With him the measure of this world he takes,
This all-containing world, himself he beats
Asunder what he takes, himself he metes
It out. He doth across with brightness fare
And light that are his own, and reigns he there,
In sleep, himself the light. No teams are there,
Nor paths, nor blisses joys delights; nor streams
Tanks lotus-pools; but from himself projects
He these. Their maker is he there. Affects
That state this canzonet:

THE ONE BIRD OF PASSAGE.

He doth in sleep
His boisterous brood at last compel to keep
Their quiet, all the bodily down doth smite.
Far poised, the golden person waxeth bright,
Upon the sleeping peering. Then through air
The one and only swan doth back repair.

The breath left guardian of his nest below,
Out of the nest doth that Immortal go.
Now high now low as he doth choose,
His lonely way the only swan pursues.

And so flights up and down in sleep he takes.
A god, forms many for himself he makes,
Himself with joyance doth 'mong women please,
And laughs and shudders too at sights he sees.

His revelry the multitude descries,
Yet on himself hath no man set his eyes.

Therefore 't is said 'Not unrestrainedly
Arouse a sleeper. Hard to heal is he
To whom he no return doth make.'
Yet some protest 'Nought else than state awake
Returned is this! What erst had met his sight,
That now he sees.' 'Not so!' cry we. 'The light
In dreams is he himself.' "

THE KING'S LARGESSE

And his Request to be told the Higher for his Soul's Release.

This did the King bestir:
"A thousand cows I give thee, reverend sir,
But higher tell me for my soul's release."

The Teacher continues his Description of the To-and-Fro Movement of the Self.

Yet still of that the teacher held his peace.
Continued he: "Now doth this person haste to go
From sleep wherein he travelled to and fro,
Beholding as it were the good the bad,
To where he origin and entrance had,
Yet bringeth with him nought him following;
To such as he can nothing ever cling."

THE KING REPEATS HIS LARGESSE

And makes again his request to be told the Higher.

Again did joy the King to give arouse.
"Your reverence, pray, accept a thousand cows;
But tell me higher for my soul's release,"
But yet of that the sage maintained his peace.

THE THIRD INSTRUCTION.

THE DESCRIPTION OF THE TO-AND-FRO MOVEMENT CONTINUED.

"Again," said he, "this person hastes to go,
Again he sleeps, so travels to-and-fro.
As doth within a stream a great fish veer
From bank to bank, at first along the near,
Along the farther next, both sides to keep,
So this one crosswise moves to wake and sleep."

DREAMLESS SLEEP.

Discoursed the teacher then of Slumber Deep:
"As in the lift above us with his sweep
And tacking wearied, hasteth, wings compressed,
Eagle or hawk to bear him to his nest;
So this one now descends to meet where he
In sleep knows no desire, no dream doth see.

His true form this, wherein is craving passed
By speedy runner, evil from him cast,
No haunting fear. A man, embraced about
By wife he loves, nothing doth know without
Nor yet within: so he, who thus hath met
With Self intelligential round him set,
Belike embraced, to same condition brought,
Doth nought within him know, without him nought.
Indeed his true form this, his one desire,
The Soul, attained, and so without desire, from fire
Of grief estranged.

THE ROOT BENEATH ALL DIVERGENCE.

"A father There is not
A father; a mother—not a mother; what
Once worlds now worlds no more; and gods now There
No longer gods; nor thief a thief; doth bear
He that an embryo's death hath enterprised
That horror There no more; a birth despised—
No more a birth despised; nor begging-saint—
More begging saint; nor who, by fierce restraint
The flesh to master, ascete hath professed—
An ascete longer. Yea, none is There oppressed
By good or evil's constant pestering more.
Behind is left at last the flaming shore
Of all heart-burnings.

THE SOURCE OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

"Read his condition so:
He sees not with the eyes, yet surely know
He sees; a break of seeing cannot be;
He, only seer, cannot cease to see,
And yet no second thing, no make or mould
Dispart from him himself, can he behold.
He smells not there and yet the while doth smell;
Of that sense too may none disruption tell;
He cannot cease who only catcheth flair;
Yet, while he smelleth, only he is there.
He tasteth not with tongue and yet tastes he;
Must taster one imperishable be;

Yet, while he tastes, another is not there,
He only of himself can be aware.
So stand all other powers he doth possess;
Not one of these can sink to nothingness.
Be it he taste, speak, hear, think, know, or touch,
Since he alone can taste or speak, can perish never such.
Keep in thy mind this axiom ever clear:
'Tis nought beside himself he knoweth near.
Were there another present, as it were,
Then might on him that other impress bear.
But if beside him not another be,
Whom other is there then to taste hear see?
Thus doth within himself his world compose
The Lord of all the known who only knows.

The Man Whose World is Spirit.

"Consider him whose world is Spirit, one
And only one. In him, howe'er they run,
All currents do in one become combined,
He self in each, they self in him, to find;
For one in all and all in one is he,
As gathered flood, wherein duality
Is not, where, be there calm or dip and swell,
All entrants one unbroken water dwell,
Met in the only Seer. Highest path
Is this of man, the topmost goal he hath,
Best world. Yea, on a portion just of this
All other creatures live, the highest bliss.

The Beatific Calculus.

The Bliss of the Spirit World,

Estimated according to the relative value of the worlds in their upward succession.

"O sovran, count
The blisses," cried the sage; "in fancy mount
The heights. Of bliss of men the highest state
That man's we deem who is both fortunate
And wealthy, lord of others, and with joys
Of man provided best. The glad employs
Of those who win the fathers' world behold.

One bliss of these contains a hundredfold
The bliss of men. Raise yet thine eye.
Survey the elves that sing in heights of sky.
One bliss of their fair world of rapturous love
Counts hundredfold the fathers' bliss above.
Gods view who have by deeds their godhead gained.
Surpasses but one bliss by these attained
The bliss of elves a hundredfold. View next
The gods born gods, by striving never vexed.
One bliss of these a hundredfold exceeds
The bliss of gods who gained their place by deeds.
Consider next Who creatures all creates,
Father and Lord. One bliss of his elates
With joy a hundred times above the bliss
Of gods by birth. Yet joy as great as this
So lofty bliss must hundred times be told,
Of Spirit-world a single bliss to hold."

Cried out the King his rapture to relieve:
"A thousand cows, your reverence, receive."
Yet would not from his old petition cease:
"The higher tell me for my soul's release!"

THE FOURTH INSTRUCTION.

"This sapient King," the teacher now confessed,
"Hath me from all my hiding-corners pressed!"
Yet not at once did he the knot untie,
But first depicted what it is to die.

THE SOUL AT DEATH.

"As lurching, creaking, forges loaded cart,
Behold the bodily self work out its part,
Tremorous, wheezing, when one goeth hence,
The Self intelligential, wrought intense,
Upon it mounted up. As round a King
At his departure thronging nobles ring,
And policemen, chariot-drivers, village heads,
So round the soul that sternly from them treads
The senses gather. Then, to weakness brought,
Be he with weight of years or sickness fraught,

As from the branchèd tree doth take release
The mango, fig, or berry, so decease
Makes he from these his limbs, bending his track
To entrance whence he came, again hastes back
To live another life.

Becoming One.

"Now mark crowd in
The senses, watch their king his fight begin,
Uphold him to their utmost in his bout.

Press too his neighbours on him from without
And cry, when those who come perceives not he,
"He is becoming one; he does not see."
["Not see!" protest we. Rather sees he, know.
It must with him the only seer be so.]

Cry they, when blooms he scents not, once loved well,
"He is becoming one; he cannot smell."
["Not smell!" Fragrance he catcheth still, be told.
He that alone doth smell, his power must hold.]

Cry they, dainties ignored when gently placed,
"He is becoming one; he doth not taste."
["Not taste!" He tastes. Tasting, be certified,
Must e'er with only taster be allied.]

Cry they, when voice he seems in vain to seek,
"He is becoming one; he cannot speak."
["Not voice possess!" Be sure indeed that he
The only speaker still must speaker be.]

Again they cry, when nought awakes his ear,
"He is becoming one; he cannot hear."
["Not hear!" How can be non-responsive found
The only one that apprehendeth sound?]

They cry, when this with that he cannot link,
"He is becoming one; he cannot think."
["Not think!" Shall that one's power of thinking be dissolved
By whom alone all thinking is resolved?]

Note they that no response he makes when kissed.
"He is becoming one, for touch is missed."
[Shall he whose touch alone we mortals share
Of touch himself be ever unaware?]

Cry they when he no consciousness doth show.
"He is becoming one; no longer doth he know."
["Not know!" Shall vacancy that one betide
In whom alone cognition doth reside?]

THE RALLYING OF THE BASAL POWERS.

"The Self apparently, beneath this stress,
Thus come to weakness and confusedness,
Now inward turns the person in the eye,
And outward forms thus ceaseth to descry;
And down into the heart the Self retires,
As cordon takes the functions' basal fires,
For breath still moves; and list! the heart doth beat.

THE DESIRE TO ACQUIRE ANOTHER BODY.

"Would that this man from all desire retreat
Had ta'en, save from desire for no desire;
So had he found beneath heart's throbbing fire
The cool retreat, e'en now, where dwells the Root
In calm deep set, that hath as bloom and fruit
Life's myriad forms, and knowing It indeed
From his attachment to these forms been freed!
But no! with this poor man it is not so.

THE SETTING-OUT TO ACQUIRE ANOTHER BODY.

"At heart's point springs a forward-reaching glow
And through that lighted door he makes resort
By eye or head or other bodily port
Back to the surge that held him thrall before.
And after him, e'en through that lighted door,
The central breath, doyen of life, forth leads.
Upon it close its retinue proceeds,
The other, comrade, breaths. All hurry hence.
The flesh is left, and with intelligence
At one he doth become. So is there gone,

When he is gone, intelligence. Upon
Him then his knowledge and his doings press,
And his experience in bygone stress,
[For arbiters and ushers these of where
In life's wild spin shall be again his share.]

The acquirement of another Body.

"As caterpillar, come to verge, non-plussed,
Together draws itself, thus based and trussed,
To launch forth other blade of grass to find,
May haply prove him for next progress kind;
This Self the body so thrusts down, to make
Next step non-knowledge bids departure take,
Himself together draws.
As, deft hands laid,
An artist takes a piece of rich brocade,
Unweaves its beauty, then doth it restore
To newer form and lovelier than before,
Just so this Self this body doth strike down,
Dismiss non-knowledge, fashion then for crown
Another form, newer, more fair, than this,
Such form as of the fathers in their bliss
Of sky-elves or of gods, or, might one dare,
What might the Creatures' Lord or Spirit bear,
Or form may be of other beings wrought.

The Comprehensiveness of the Self.

"Yea, what from out this Self may not be brought,
A matrix rich? Spirit is This. Inbound
Are knowledge, mind, breath, hearing, seeing, found;
Earth, water, wind, space, strength, non-vigour too;
Wish, wish-not, wrath, not-wrath, what one may do,
And do may not; yea, everything in this is blent.
Here meet we what the old-time adage meant:
'There's this, there's that, there's all intilt.'

Acts decide the Sort of Man.

"The sort
Of man the acts whereto he doth comport
Decide. The man who in the life he leads

Does good, doth good become, who—evil deeds,
Evil becometh he. His deeds—to me
'T is plain—do make the man. As deeds, so—he.
The doer is the man that comes to be.

Desire is the Source of Acts.

"But people say 'Not so we understand.
The "This *and* that"—our adage—makes demand
For man of "This *or* that". This person not
Of acts is made; but of desire, we wot,
Construct is he, yea of desire alone."
'Made of desire' he is at first, I own;
But choice produceth doing, doing—deed;
Himself-fallen-in-with-that is then his meed.

The Pull of the Deed.

"Mark now, O sovran, that the following verse
That direful course describes in fashion terse:

> Goes with the deed just where be mind attached
> The germ within of him thus inly latched.
> End of his act in yon world gained,
> Whate'er was here below attained,
> Back from that world above he then
> Comes to this world of act again.

Such he who doth desire.

The Attainment of Him who is without Desire.

"But now the lot
Of him take measure, who desireth not,
With no desire, but with desire removed,
Desire obtained, yea Soul alone approved.
From that man with their hurrying rout
His life-breaths make no questful progress out.
Spirit being, the Soul his one desire,
Within, to Spirit, doth that man retire.

Therein, O king, thou dost the secret hold.
Here is a verse in which it is enrolled:

> All the desires at last unloosed
> That in his heart had found their roost,
> Mortal, immortal come to be,
> Spirit now attaineth he.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE BODY OF HIM WHO IS WITHOUT DESIRE.

"What of the body? As of snake the slough,
A narrow house within which long enough,
If called to mind, then only to despise,
Lies on an ant-hill, so this body lies.

AGAIN, THE ATTAINMENT.

"Yea, lo! thus bodiless and freed from death,
Spirit and Glory now, the viewless breath!"

THE KING'S LARGESSE AGAIN.

Whereat did joy again the king bestir.
"A thousand cows I give thee, reverend sir."

THE FIFTH INSTRUCTION.

THE GLORY OF THE SELF.

Did next the sage, attained this consummate,
Upon the glory of the Soul dilate:
"The great the unborn Self in verity
We here bespeak. Among the senses he
(The teacher while he spake did make to rest
As at the first his hand upon his breast)
And of intelligence is made. The space
Within the heart he holds as resting-place
And all commands, lord he of all, of all,
Yea, overlord, to whom doth not befall
Increased to be by deed ignoble wrought,
Nor less be made by ill to triumph brought;
The beings' overlord and guard; the dyke
That holds the worlds apart, yet doth not strike
Asunder.

TOIL AND DENIAL.

"Him the divines do seek to know
By Veda-repetition they bestow,
By sacrifices, gifts, austerity,
And fasting. Knowing simply such as he,
Possessed enthusiasts keep them dumb.

Perpetual wanderers do men become,
Just on the quest for him their world to be.
The men who lived in ancient days we see,
This having known, no wish for offspring frame,
But 'What with offspring shall we do' exclaim,
'Whose is this Self this world?' Such men as they
Stood up from wish for sons, fared forth away,
Eke from desire for wealth, for worlds, to go
Upon the course of life that beggars know;
For they in wish for sons, as wish for gain,
And wish for gain, as wish for worlds, each twain,
Did but the weaving of desire detect.

THE UNGRASPABILITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE SELF.

"All designation is upon him wrecked.
'Is this he? That—he?' 'No!' and 'No!' 'T is so
Alone, can those reply who that Self know;
Not seizable, for none with hands to take;
Not to be crushed, and so for none to break;
Attached to nought, and so by nothing held;
Unbound, sways not, compelled
By neither 'Hence[1] performed I wrong' nor 'Hence[1]
Achieved I right,' but, crossing over thence,
The done and not-done burn him not; behind
He leaveth both. This verse hath that in mind:

> He that, within a Brahmin dwelling, makes him great,
> Acquires by deed no greater and no minished state.
> The Self it is, that doth the path to him make clear.
> Who knoweth this, the evil deed doth not besmear.[2]

AGAIN, THE GLORY OF THE SELF.

"Therefore, made calm, subdued, a knower-thus,
Within himself at ease, to suffer strenuous,
Composed, doth in the soul the Soul perceive,
Sees all as Soul. No ill him crosses; leave
He takes of evil all. Imparts no scorch
To him the flame of ill; yea evil's torch

[1] A scholiast interprets 'Hence' to mean 'because I am in the body.'

[2] The original of this quotation, which the translator believes to be what was originally quoted, is here translated. See Note.

He doth torment with fire his own. Set free
From evil, passion dark, and doubt, doth he
Become a Brahmin. Here, O king, behold
The Spirit-world before thy gaze." Thus told
At last his secret Yājnavalkya.

The Submission of Janaka.

Rapt
With climax such, the king cried, kingship sapped,
"I the Videhas do for thraldom give,
Myself as well, to thee, thy slaves to live,
O reverend sir."

The Reply of the Sage.

To which the sage replied
"The great the unborn Soul, so glorified,
Is none but he that eateth common food
And doth dispense the manifestly good.
The man who this doth know, the good doth find."

The Envoy.

This as his envoy then the sage consigned:
"Spirit is this, the great, the unborn Soul,
Ageless, deathless, who never fear need thole;
Yea, not one fear can there in Spirit be.
And O! the man who knows this: Spirit—he."

13

YĀJNAVALKYA'S LAST TESTAMENT

From The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest

Yājnavalkya's Last Testament

YĀJNAVALKYA MAKES KNOWN TO MAITREYĪ THE ARRIVAL FOR HIM OF THE FINAL STAGE OF LIFE.

"The time, O Maitreyī, to us has come
From thee to part and from Kātyāyanī,"
Said Yājnavalkya. "Nought may be unspared,
This pleasant house, these richly yielding kine
That low around, the neighbours known so long,
Thee and Kātyāyanī, consorts to me
In this my well-filled term of fleeting life;
All must be left. The closing stage its call
Makes clear. Into the wilderness I fare,
To place of session in the forest find,
Where, far removed from all that doth distract,
I may cut off all knots, yea finest threads,
That hold my soul a captive, for it yet
Doth cling (tho' conscious in itself that such
Dependent state doth not the Self befit)
Upon the hampering ever-pulling web
Of circumstance; and woe betide me, if
I be not free before death come. So haste
I now to this my task. But first must I
With thee and with Kātyāyanī conclude
A final settlement."

THE QUESTION OF MAITREYĪ.

Now Maitreyī
Upon philosophy was wont at times
To make discourse. Kātyāyanī

No more than women for the most part do
Gave thought to that.
So now said Maitreyī
"My lord, were at this moment all this earth
Replete with acquisitions mine, should I
Thereby become immortal?"

THE SAGE'S ANSWER.

"Nay," replied
To her the sage, "Just as the life of those
With ample means, so then thy life would be;
But in possessions is there found no hope
Of immortality."

MAITREYĪ'S REQUEST.

Said Maitreyī
"With that whereby immortal I can not
Become, what can there be for me to do?
Just what my lord doth know, pray, sire, tell me."

THE SAGE'S SATISFACTION.

Exclaimed the sage, "Ah! Lo! Dear always thou,
Dear as are dear the words thou now dost say,
That make to me more clear, far as words may—
For words for this fall short—thyself. Come near,
Sit down. I will explain: but, pray, seek thou
To ponder for thyself, while I to thee
Those things show forth as best I may.

THE CYNOSURE.

"Know then,
Not is the husband for love of the husband dear;
It is love of the Soul that makes the husband dear.
Nor is for love of the wife the wife held dear;
Love of the Soul it is that makes her dear.
Nor are for love of sons the sons held dear;
Love of the Soul it is that makes them dear.
It is not for the love of gain that gain is held dear;
Love of the Soul it is that makes gain dear.
Nor is for love of the priesthood the priesthood dear.
Love of the Soul it is makes priesthood dear.

Nor is for love of chiefdom the chiefdom dear;
Love of the Soul it is makes chiefdom dear.
Not for love of the worlds are the worlds held dear;
Love of the Soul it is that makes worlds dear.
Nor is it love of the gods the gods makes dear;
Love of the Soul it is that makes gods dear.
Not for love of the beings are the beings held dear;
Love of the Soul it is makes the beings dear.
It is not for love of the All that the All is held dear;
It is love of the Soul that makes the All held dear.

THAT WHICH IS NOT KNOWN IN THE SOUL DESERTS US.

"O Maitreyī, him who the priesthood knows
In aught else than the Soul the priesthood hath
Abandoned. Him that doth the chiefdom know
In aught else than the Soul the chiefdom hath
Cast off. The worlds have discarded the man
Who them in aught else than the Soul doth know.
Who knows the gods in aught else than the Soul
The gods have given up. The beings him
Relinquished have, who knows them otherwise
Than in the Soul. Yea, hath the All him that
The All in aught else than the Soul doth know
Left derelict. So, let be known to thee:
The priesthood, chiefdom, all the worlds, the gods,
Beings around, yea, everything in this
Wide world is what, just what, the Soul is.

THE IMPORTANCE OF GIVING ATTENTION TO THE SOUL.

"So,
The Soul indeed it is that should be seen,
Be hearkened to, be thought on, pondered on.
With seeing, hearkening to, and thinking on,
And understanding of, the Soul, behold,
This great World-All is known.

ANALOGIES.

"It is as, when
A drum is being beat, one could not grasp
The sound, unless one seized and held the drum
Or held the player. Then should sound be grasped.

It is as, when a conch is being blown,
The sounds one could not hold, unless one seized
And held the shell or held the blower. Then should
Sound be held.

It is as when a lute
Is being played. The sounds one could not grasp,
Unless one seized and held the lute, or held
The player. Then should one grasp the sound.

It is as when with fuel damp a fire
Is laid and from it clouds of smoke ascend,
So many rolling spires; thus have been breathed
Out of this Being great the Vedas three
(To wit, the Verses, Formulas, and Chants),
The spells we Átharvāngirasas name,
Legends, and Ancient Lore, and Sciences,
The Upanishads we divulge to those
Initiate and deemed prepared to hear,
And Verses, Aphorisms, Addita
To Commentaries, Commentaries. Yea,
This world, the other world, and beings all
Are all from him breathed out.

THE ONE RENDEZVOUS.

"It comes this way:
As is the sea the meeting-place of all
The waters; so the skin is meeting-place
Of touches all, the tongue—the counting house
Of all the tastes, the nostrils—rendezvous
Of all the scents, the eye—uniting point
Of all the forms, the ear—home of all sounds,
The mind—location where intentions all
Are set, the heart—the trysting-ground
Of all the sciences, the hands—resort
Of all the acts, the generative means—
The root of all the bliss, the vent—outlet
Of all riddance, the feet—uniting-point
Of all the goings, speech—the treasury
Wherein are all the Vedas stored.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SELF.

"It is
As if a lump of salt in water cast
Did through the water right dissolve that so
No grain of it might, as it were, be seized
And taken forth, yet, sip the water where
One will, the water tasteth plainly salt;
For lo, this Being great, that hath no end
Nor is by farther bank confined, is found,
When reconnoitred, this, nought else, to be—
Just an amalgam of discernment.

THE CEASING OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

"So
It is with us. As comes to consciousness
The salt, tasted within the lifted hand,
And when returned is in the water lost,
Ungraspable, nor possible for sight;
So out of just these beings one stands up,
Then into them one vanishes away.
At that, mark thou, for him that goeth forth
There is no consciousness. Lo! thus say I."
These were the words that Yājnavalkya spake.

MAITREYĪ'S BEWILDERMENT.

Exclaimed then Maitreyī: "My lord hath now
Indeed bewildered me by this his speech,
That there should be for him that goeth forth
No consciousness."

THE SELF IN ITSELF.

Then Yājnavalkya said:
"Lo! verily what here I speak gives not
Bewilderment, but is sufficient for
Intelligence. This Being contemplate,
The One, the only, in himself complete,
All his outbreathing. Where is, as it were,
Duality, one doth another see,
One doth another smell, another doth
In speech address, upon another think,

Another understand; but where indeed
Hath everything become nought else than just
One's self, whereby and whom should one then smell?
Whereby and whom should one then see? Whereby
And whom should one then hear? Whereby should one
Then speak and whom address? Whereby should one
Then think and on whom then give thought? Whereby
And whom should one then understand? Whereby
Shall one Him understand by means of whom
One understands this All? Lo! Say whereby
One may the Understander understand?

Herein is Immortality.

Not this, not that, the Soul; unseizable,
Not seized can be; yea, indestructible,
It cannot be destroyed; and unattached,
For it doth not attach itself; unbound,
It trembles not, and is not injured. Thus
Is, Maitreyī, to thee th' instruction told.
Lo! Here indeed is immortality."

The Departure of Yājnavalkya.

Then Yājnavalkya, spoken that, withdrew.

14

THE WORLD BEYOND:

From The Secret Teaching in the Chant.

The World Beyond

THE DIVIDING DIKE.

Behold the Soul!—the dike held up to part
These worlds asunder. Cross nor day, nor night,
Nor death, nor grief that burns, nor deed well done,
Nor deed done ill, the rampart narrow. Yea,
All ills at it turn back. For that bright world
Across the sharp-set edge, the Spirit-world,
Is free from evils all.

THE RESULT OF CROSSING.

And so, That crossed,
The blind becomes no longer blind, doth lose
The wounded man his wounds, the man that is
With sickness scorched his fever knows no more.
Yea, night hath slipped entirely into day,
For here the sun in making day makes night,
But there, beyond the day and night, doth he
Unbroken shine; yea, holds that Spirit-world
A light perpetual.

THE POSSESSORS OF THE WORLD BEYOND.

And they alone
That Spirit-world possess who do it seek
And find within the life of discipline
Pursued by those who students are professed
Of Spirit. These alone it is who may
In all the worlds go wandering where they will.

15

THE SECRET TEACHING TO THE GODS AND DEMONS

BY THE LORD OF CREATURES
REGARDING THE TRUE SELF:

From the Secret Teaching in the Chant.

The Secret Teaching to the Gods and Demons

BY THE LORD OF CREATURES
REGARDING THE TRUE SELF:

THE COUNSEL OF THE LORD.

"The Self from evil freed, removed from age
And death and grief, for whom the Real is his desire
And his conception, seek! Let no man tire
To search him out and know! That lore obtained,
Then all the worlds and all desires are gained."
Thus spake the Creatures' Lord.

THE RESOLVE OF THE GODS AND DEMONS.

That message heard,
The gods and demons cried, each host bestirred:
"Come, let us knowledge of this Self attain,
Therewith all worlds and all desires to gain."

DEPUTIES OF THESE BECOME DISCIPLES OF THE LORD OF CREATURES.

Indra the gods dispatched. The demons sent
Virocana. Each, upon one mission bent,
The other found, without co-planning, stand

Before the Lord, each holding in his hand
The wood to light his wished-for teacher's fire;
Accepted, lived with him, with one desire
Consumed, the life for two and thirty years
That is pursued with self-restraint by those
Who study sacred lore.

THE LORD'S INQUIRY.

Asked then the Lord
"Ye twain, for what came ye?"

THE ANSWER OF THE TWO DISCIPLES.

With one accord
Said they "'The Self from evil freed and age
And death and grief, dispart from hunger's rage
And thirst's, for whom the Real is his desire
And his conception, seek! Let no man tire
To search him out and know! That lore obtained,
Then all the worlds and all desires are gained.'
Thou spakest thus, men say. O Lord, have we,
Him seeking, spent this course with thee."

THE LORD'S GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE SELF.

Said he "That Person in the eye appears.
'T is he, learn ye, that knows not death or fears.
Lo! Spirit—he."

THE SELF SEEN IN REFLEXION.

THE EXPERIMENT.

"And this then whom we see
In water and in mirror, who is he?"
"That person in the eye," the Lord replied,
"In all reflectors certes is descried.
This dish of water take. Let each survey
The self therein, and then to me each say
What of the Self he does not understand."
They looked within the dish upheld in hand.
"What see ye?" asked the Lord. "We see," said they,
"The Self itself in miniature display,

Each item clear, to hair and nails." "Now don,"
Said he, "your garments rich, put jewels on,
Attire yourselves with care and nicety.
Look in again and say what now ye see."
So out at once the two went forth to don
Their garments rich and jewels to put on,
Attire themselves with care and nicety,
And then looked in. "What see ye now?" asked he.
Said they: "Our self again we look upon,
In garments rich, with jewels now put on,
And all attired with care and nicety."
"That is the Self of which I spake," said he,
"The Person not by death or terrors seized,
Lo! Spirit—he." Heart-quieted, much pleased,
They went.

The Lord's Verdict.

But, as they went, the Lord upon
Them looked and said "Behold these two have gone,
The Self not grasped or understood. All they
That hold That secret doctrine fall away."

The Doctrine thus announced Virocana transmits to the Devils.

Virocana, when to his host he came,
To them did, tranquil still, that lore proclaim:
"Just this, the Self which with our eyes we see,
That is the Self which should exalted be
And waited on. The man who That deems great
And waiteth on, both this and yonder state
He gains."

That explains present-day use of the exclamation "Devilish-he!"

That shews why now we fling the name
"Devilish" on that man with sharp-cut blame,
Who gives not, hath not faith, no offering bids.
"Devilish he!"—our cry. When such one rids
Him of his mortal shell, his pals it deck

With begged-for dress (or "ornament"—so reck
They that!); for with such trash these foolish feign
That they the world that lies beyond shall gain.

BUT INDRA DISCOVERS DANGER IN THE DOCTRINE.

But Indra, ere he at the gods arrived,
Saw plainly error was in this connived.
"This body richly clad, adorned, and tired,
In its reflection is indeed admired,
But blind or lamed or maimed this fleshly frame,
This reflex shows itself in each the same,
And should this body perish with decay,
Completely This in consort falls away.
Nought to enjoy I see."

SO HE RETURNS TO THE LORD OF CREATURES.

So turned he back,
Untold the news in which he saw such lack.
With fuel for a teacher's fire in hand
He took again before the Lord his stand.

AT THE LORD'S INQUIRY HE MAKES COMPLAINT.

His late disciple then the Lord addressed:
"Thou, O Munificent, thy heart at rest,
Departedst with Virocana. What then
Doth bring thee back, a suppliant again?"
Said he, "If be this body richly tired,
The Self seen in reflection is admired,
But blind or lamed or maimed this fleshly frame,
This reflex shows itself in each the same;
And, should this body perish with decay,
Completely then doth this one fall away.
Nought to enjoy I see."

THE LORD INVITES HIM TO A SECOND COURSE OF DISCIPLINE.

"With him," said he,
"Munificent, 't is so. I will to thee,
However, more concerning this explain.
Dwell with me two and thirty years again."

THE SELF IN DREAMS.

This second term of discipline passed through,
The Lord declared "The Self that doth pursue,
Exuberant, in dreams his glad career,
That is the Self that knows not death or fear."

INDRA IS AGAIN DISAPPOINTED.

So forth, heart-quieted again, he went,
But e'er he reached the gods felt discontent:
"Indeed, this Self in dreams, not blind is he,
Nor lame, though blind or lame this body be.
Be there defect through which doth suffer This,
Consorts not That to likewise be amiss.
Yea, be one murdered, yet that self survives
(See him then enter dreams of other lives).
Natheless he, as it were, hath pain, is killed,
Naked is stripped, with nausea thrilled,
Yea, weeps. Nought here enjoyable I see."

SO, HE RETURNS AGAIN.

Hied back the chief of gods accordingly,
Again to take a would-be learner's stand,
A wished-for teacher's fuel in his hand.

THE LORD INVITES HIM TO A THIRD COURSE OF DISCIPLINE.

Again the Lord the suppliant addressed:
"Thou, O Munificent, thy heart at rest
Departedst thence; pray tell me then
Desiring what, thou comest back again?"
"This self in dreams, whom thou commendest me,
Though blind this body be, not blind is he;
Nor lame if this be lame; defect in this,
Finds not That one himself in that amiss.
Yea, be one murdered, yet that Self survives
(For enters he the dreams of other lives).
Natheless he, as it were, hath pain, is killed,
Naked is stripped, with nausea thrilled,
Yea, weeps. Nought here enjoyable I see!"
"Munificent, 't is even so," said he,
"With him. But yet again as pupil dwell
Years two and thirty. More I thee would tell."

THE SELF IN DREAMLESS SLEEP.

So with the Lord he spent a session third.
Then said the Lord, "When by no dream bestirred
One sleepeth sound, composed, in settled ease,
That is the Self nor death nor fear can seize,
Lo! Spirit—he."

INDRA IS A THIRD TIME DISAPPOINTED.

Again content,
The chief of gods to meet his host then went,
But yet again, before he saw the gods appear,
Saw in the message that he carried fear:
"This Self knows not himself as 'I am he,'
Nor any beings here; hath gone, I see,
To perishment entire. Nought to enjoy
For me!" With that, stopped short in his employ,
He turned, before the Lord again to stand,
A wished-for teacher's fuel in his hand.

THE LORD INVITES THE ENVOY TO DWELL WITH HIM FIVE YEARS MORE.

Again the Lord the suppliant addressed:
"Thou, O Munificent, thy heart at rest
Departedst hence; pray tell me then,
Desiring what thou comest back again."
Said he "This Self himself as 'I am he'
Knows not, nor beings here; hath gone, I see,
To perishment entire. Here to enjoy
Is nought for me! Held back in my employ,
I back to more of thee inquire have fared."
"Munificent, with him," the Lord declared,
"'T is even so. But more there is to tell,
Past which—no more. Five years yet add, to dwell
With me."

THE ONE-HUNDRED-AND-ONE YEARS' COURSE.

Five more did Indra spend; which done,
The total reached one hundred years and one.
Hence people say "The One Munificent
As pupil with the Lord of Creatures spent
One hundred years and one to learn the lore
Of Spirit."

THE TRUE SELF.

The True Self Described.

That completing period o'er,
The Creatures' Lord gave forth his last and best.
"Munificent," said he, "by Death possessed
This body is, and yet the Self in it holds sway,
The Bodiless that knoweth not decay.
Possess the man that in a body dwells
Pleasures and pains. None these expels
While in a body; but their dire stress
Hath no affect upon the bodiless.
The wind no body hath. The clouds and flash
Are bodiless; so too—the thunder crash.
When these past yonder space arise and reach
At last the highest light, then steps forth each
In form its own. With him it is likewise.
Dreamless his sleep, serene he doth arise
From out this body; highest light he gains;
Consort therewith, the form his own attains;
Person supreme, supremely makes his way,
Laughing and making sport, with women gay,
With chariots, or with friends. No more he heeds
His comrade old, his body. Here certes leads
The breath a draught-beast's life in body's yoke!

The Functions of the Self.

"Now, when toward space [here gazed forth he that spoke]
The eye is set, the Person in the eye
Looks out, the means by which he doth descry—
The eye. Mark, too, it is the Self as well,
That knows, the nostrils used, 'This let me smell;'
The Self again, that knows, on utterance bent,
'Now let me this express!' his instrument—
The voice; also the Self, that 'Let me hear!'
Doth know, for that—his instrument, the ear;
He too, that knows 'This let me think,' the mind—
His means, his 'eye divine'—that name assigned,
For gods the mind as eye have ta'en, where through
They may—he too—of things around take view;
And by that eye, the mind, desires he sees
And, by his choosing, takes his gladsome ease.

THE REVERENCE FOR THE SELF.

"The gods who in the Spirit-world do dwell.
This Self do hold in reverence, truth to tell.
From Him as source they all the worlds do take,
And all desires. And he who search doth make
For Him and Him hath found and understands,
He all the worlds and all desires commands."

SIGNATURE.

Thus spake the Father of all Creatures. Yea,
These are the words the Creatures' Lord did say.

16

THE ADVANTAGE OF KNOWLEDGE OF ONE'S NATURE:

From The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The Advantage of Knowledge of One's Nature

What should be Ascertained.

Who the young steer, his house, roof, post, rope, knows,
Keeps off his cousins seven, who are foes.

The Information Given.

The breath that moves within the mouth, then, know,
With constant current through it, to and fro,
The vital breath: That is the pushful Steer;
The House in which he dwells—one's body here;
Roof of the House—one's head; the breath that through
One's body moves—the Post drave down to hold him to;
Food as the Rope attached to that we find,
Which to his house the pushful Steer doth bind.

The Seven Gods and the Child.

But hath, with that but little yet been told,
For next is here a wonder to unfold,
For by the Child do Seven in worship stay,
No one of which submitteth to decay,
And, while they pay to him their reverence,
Their several powers do they in him dispense,
By these themselves unto the Child do bind,
Yea, do themselves within the Infant find.

Extendeth in the eye's red branching streaks
Rudra, the Lightning-god, who vengeance wreaks,
With shrieks, as down he dives from stormy wrack
With flaming scarlet back and belly black—
See charred the scar that ripped the giant tree!
And o'er the eye the water wells; there see
The God of Rain. And that diminutive
In the eye's chamber we who watch see live,
That to his window steps and out doth peer
And restless moves as we to him draw near,
What is he but the Sun-god in the sky,
There in the dark, the while supreme on high?
Gleams in that dark a spark of love or ire;
Who in that kindles but the God of Fire?
In constrast with the black, behold the white;
What that but Indra, Chief-god's, realm, who might
Doth vaunt within the re-illumined sky,
The darkening serpent slain, erst coiled on high,
The cows set free that give the rain? See thrid
The Earth its weft along eye's under lid,
In upper lash the Heaven on him its hold
Maintain.

The man, who knoweth, be it told,
That these do thus in him for help avail
And worship him, his food shall never fail.

17

THE EIGHT WARDENS OF THE HEAD:

From The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The Eight Wardens of the Head

This verse we find:

" There is a cup
With opening downward bottom up."
" Within it," it proceeds to tell,
" Doth every form of glory dwell,
And round its rim seers seven sit,
Their ward to keep: three pairs—to wit
The pairs that hear and see and smell—
And one who tastes. And mark thou well,
That voice doth there an eighth seer make,
Whom Spirit doth for comrade take."

18

THE HOMAGE OF ALL THINGS TO HIM WHO IN ALL THINGS SEES THE SELF:

From The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The Homage of All Things to Him who in All Things sees the Self

As nobles, policemen, chariot-drivers, heads
Of villages, alert, his journey's dreads
O'ercome, wait on their King seen drawing nigh,
With gifts of food, drink, lodging, this their cry—
"Our King, our King, he comes!" So all things wait
On him who sees in all things small or great
The Self. "The Spirit comes!" the cry they lift,
And glad is he, glad—all, at each their gift.

19

THE MEANING OF THE THUNDER:

From The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The Meaning of the Thunder

Introduction.

Now learn what means that sharp portentous cry,
The "Da! Da! Da!" repeated in the sky.

The Lord's Parting Word.

Unto the Creatures' Lord in ancient day
His threefold offspring—gods, men, demons they—
As humble pupils came with him to stay,
That he might them in sacred learning ground
(Just as in custom now our youths are bound);
And, when their course of studentship expired,
Each company a parting-word desired.

The "Da!" to the Gods.

First came the gods their farewell-word to seek:
"Last counsel now we would his honour speak."
But nought to them on wait he utter would
Save "Da!" and asked "Now, have ye understood?"
"We have his honour understood," said they;
"Thou '**Dāmyata**!' (subdue yourselves!) didst say."

The "Da!" to Men.

Men next drew near their farewell-word to seek:
"Do thou a valediction to us speak";
But likewise nought to them vouchsafe he would

Save "Da!" and asked "Now, have ye understood?"
"We have his honour understood," said they;
"His honour '**Datta**!' (Give!) to us didst say."

THE "DA!" TO THE DEMONS.

And next the demons came his word to seek:
"Will now to us his honour deign to speak?"
But nought again to them announce he would
Save "Da!" and asked "Now, have ye understood?"
"We have his honour understood," said they;
"Thou '**Dáyadhvam**!' (Be kind!) to us didst say."

So, still we hear reverberate on high
That three times "Da!" throughout the sky.

A COMMENT BY THE WEST.

Did thus these Easterns recognise,
As urgent bidding from the skies,
That even gods must practice "Be subdued!"
Would they not be by whelming fate pursued;
That men who would as human beings live
Must make the motto of their conduct "Give!";
That demons too, would they not uproot find,
Must with their torments ever mix "Be kind!"

So each give ear
That now doth hear
That sharp portentous sound!
Be god, or man, or demon thou,
At this loud cry from heaven bow!
Let charity be found!

Perchance 't is hinted: Gods and demons yet
Their saving motto keep, but men forget.

20

THE SUPREMACY OF THE REAL:

From The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The Supremacy of the Real

This world at first have seen should we,
Had we been there the sight to see,
The Waters, nothing else, to be;
Witnessed their seeming-vacuous surge
From out itself the Spirit urge;
For be, my dear, this known to thee
Spirit the Real indeed to be;
Seen Spirit from itself make rise
The Lord of Births before our eyes;
Next viewed that Lord the gods produce,
Great powers from out himself let loose
That hold the Real as Real in awe.
Such was the sight our seers saw.

21

THE FALSE IN TRUTH'S EMBRACE:

From The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The False in Truth's Embrace

Now note three syllables we find
In **Satyam** (Truth, the Real) combined,
First **sa**, **ti** second, **yam** the third.[1]
That **ti** means 'falsehood' be inferred
(Since element in **an-ṛtam**,
The which is 'falsehood,' **ti** doth come).[2]

So, **sat**-plus-**yam** (the True) is seen
With 'falsehood,' **ti**, put in between;
Thus Truth, as shown by verbal make,
Doth o'er the False preponderance take,
And in the Real False holds its place
Because within the Real's embrace,
And, not thus held, could never be.
'T is plain. No **satyam**, then no **ti**.

The man who this relation knows
The False harms not as on he goes.

[1] Satyam is thus regarded as tri-syllabic—'sa-ty-yam.'

[2] The explanation in brackets is not in the Upanishad, but is given, Hume at this place tells us, by the Commentator.

22

THE SUPREME AUSTERITIES:

From The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.

The Supreme Austerities

Say ye? "High ascete, he who stands
Showing the crowd his bony hands
And staring ribs; so wins surprise
By these self-pressed austerities."
Nay! Rather he who stems life's ills,
Abjures dark passions, spites their thrills,
By sickness broken, bears the blow.

Say ye? "Great master, who doth go
Within the forest from his own
To merge his thoughts in session lone.'
Nay! This, the dead man carried there,
Who be his bearers unaware.

Say ye? "Supreme—he who desires
Hath quenched in serving altar fires."
Nay! This, the dead upon the wood,
Whose flesh the fire consumes as food,
Thus bearing, as its flames ascend,
The flesh entirely to its end.

Outlined in each of these see ye
An acme of austerity.
If wit of that hath entered in,
That man the world supreme doth win.

23

THE SIN-DETERRENT FIRE:

From The Secret Teaching of Maitri.

The Sin-deterrent Fire

That they who do the Spirit know
Are set secure this verse doth show.

As with the kindled mount, when flames ascend,
No longer beast nor bird seek covert there;
So too with them who Spirit apprehend,
No more do sins, to hide within, repair.

24

THE NECESSITY THAT THE SELF SHOULD REVEAL ITSELF TO ITSELF:

From
The Secret Teaching of the Possessor of the White Mules,
The Secret Teaching by Kaṭha, and
The Secret Teaching to the Tonsured.

The Necessity that the Self should reveal itself to itself

A. The Misery of the Individual Soul ignorant of its true Self.

Within the all-things-quickening reel,
In all things set, the Spirit-wheel,
Deeming, through that so dazzling art,
The Driver and himself apart,
    Flutters the swan.
Lo! welcomed by Him graciously,
He enters immortality,
    His anguish gone.

B. The Necessity of Abstention from Evil, of Intent Will, and of Peace.

Not he who hath not made to cease
His ways from ill, in will not tense,
Nor hath in mind reached calm and peace,
Can gain Him by intelligence.

C. This Self not gained by Learning.

This Self—not by instruction gained is He,
Nor by much hearing, or sagacity.

Whom He doth choose, 't is he that doth Him take,
Whose body He doth choose His own to make.

D. The Revelation in the Heart.

Smaller than world's minutest part,
And past the greatest great as well,
The Self within the creature's heart,
Set down within the hidden cell,
The Effortless, the creature sees,
And lo! thereat his sorrow flees;
The greatness of the Self descries
Made manifest before his eyes
By the Implanter's favour kind,
To him thus graciously inclined.

E. Characteristics of the Self and the Effect of Thinking upon the Self.

Him, sitting, that doth far pursue,
And, lying, everywhere doth hie,
The god of joy and not-joy, who
Can other claim to know than I?
Among th' embodied bodiless,
Among th' unsteady ever staid,
That outward doth His presence press,
The Self, whom, viewing in one's mind,
As He His glory doth unbind,
Means burning grief as ashes laid.

Notes on the Selections

1. THE WORLD AS THE HORSE-SACRIFICE.

BAU. I.I.

The Horse-Sacrifice, **aśva-medha** (**áśva,** m. horse [Cp. Gk. *hippos,* dialectic *ikkos*; Lat. *equus*]; **médha,** m. (1) juice of meat, (2) sap and strength, essential part, esp. of the sacrificial victim; (3) sacrificial victim; animal sacrifice). [L.]

Winternitz tells us that the Horse-Sacrifice was one which "only a mighty king, a powerful conqueror, or lord of the world might offer. Old sagas and epic poems report kings of old time, who fulfilled this offering, and it meant the highest fame for a ruler if one could say of him 'He has offered the horse-sacrifice.' "[1]

L. D. Barnett, in his *Antiquities of India,* informs us that the stallion chosen for sacrifice was, after certain offerings had been performed, brought out and, after further ceremonial, allowed to roam about for a year at its own free will, guarded by a troop of youths who protected it from harm.[2]

The mode by which the claim was secured which the performance of the sacrifice implied is thus described by Arthur W. Ryder: "If a king aspired to the title of emperor or king of kings he was at liberty to celebrate the Horse-Sacrifice. A horse was set free to wander at will for a year, and was escorted by a band of noble youths who were not permitted to interfere with its movements. If the horse wandered into the territory of another king, such a king must either submit to be vassal of the horse's owner or must fight him. If the owner of the horse received the submission, with or without fighting, of all the kings into whose territories the horse wandered during the year of freedom, he offered the horse in sacrifice and assumed the imperial title."[3]

As to the spiritual efficacy of the horse-sacrifice Winternitz quotes this from the Śata-patha Brāhmaṇa: "Verily he who performs the horse-sacrifice makes Prajā-pati [the

[1] Winternitz, *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur,* I, 151–.
[2] See L. D. Barnett, *Antiquities of India,* p. 169–.
[3] Arthur W. Ryder, *Kālidāsa,* p. 128.

Lord of Creatures] complete and himself becomes complete[1]; and this, indeed, is the atonement for everything, the remedy for everything. Thereby the gods redeem all sin, and he who performs that sacrifice redeems all sin."[2]

"*The Flood*," **sam-udrá**, m. a gathering of waters. ['a confluence,' √**ud**, 'spring; flow.' (Cp. Lat. *und-a*, 'wave'; Gk. *hud-ōr;* Eng. *wat-er*) + **saṁ**, 'together.'] [L.] See p. 208.

"*mother-place*," **yoni**, 'womb.' See p. 183.

"*elves in sky*," **Gandharvas.** See Vocabulary.

"*As he the rider, so his world.*"

In a lecture delivered in Moscow in 1918, after the Russian Revolution, in memory of Leo Tolstoi, at a public session of the Society of True Freedom, Valentine Bulgakov, who, Dr. Hans Hartmann tells us, was "Tolstoi's last secretary and the whole time of Tolstoi's end shared Tolstoi's life inner and outer,"[3] gives a description of the great Russian's message that corresponds to the teaching here. "It is an error," says Bulgakov, "to think that Tolstoi makes a summons only to organise agricultural communities, to abstain from flesh, to wear a blouse, and put on peasant's boots. The cry he raises is not for external renunciation, but complete inner transformation. *It is in so far as the individual transforms himself, that he is adapted to become helper to the transformation of the world*" [emphatic printing in German translation, from the original Russian].[4]

"*Seem these two twilights in our eyes to glow with blood of Sacrifice.*" "*So did these men the Law descry: 'The All to be the All to be must die!'*"

Compare Robert Bridges's lines in *The Testament of Beauty:*

> delicat as the shifting hues
> that sanctify the silent dawn with wonder-gleams,
> whose evanescence is the seal of their glory,
> consumed in self-becoming of eternity;
> till every moment as it flyeth, cryeth "Seize,
> Seize me er' I die! I am the Life of Life." (ll. 1351–6.)

[1] The universe was regarded as the Evolution of Prajāpati. A mode of that Evolution is described in Selection 2 (BAU. 1.2).

[2] Winternitz, *A Concise Dictionary of Eastern Religions*, Art. "Aśvamedha."

[3] Dr. Hans Hartmann in Foreword to the pamphlet antitled *Leo Tolstoi und die Gegenwart*, which contains the lecture here quoted and others by Bulgakov regarding Tolstoi.

[4] P. 11 of said pamphlet.

"To meet the cost—the placid depth of Endless Peace."

Contrast with the omnipotent sacrifice arising out of the ocean of eternal peace, that is taught in this Upanishad, the "omnipotent pleasure" with "divination of Love" that arises out of the same Nature's calm according to Robert Bridges's teaching in his *Testament of Beauty:*

> the oceantide of the omnipotent Pleasur of God,
> flushing all avenues of life, and unawares
> by thousandfold approach forestalling its full flood
> with divination of the secret contacts of Love,—
> of faintest ecstasies aslumber in Nature's calm. (ll. 1344–8.)

2. THE EVOLUTION OF THE COSMOS.

BAU. I.2.

"O mark thou well how much doth Voice,
When we her words inspect, make known."

The profound way in which these ancient Āryans regarded the announcements of Voice seems to be well illustrated by Coleridge's meditations on grammar in the *Greek Grammar* he prepared for his son.

> And from this last distinction, or species of causative motion, stepping into life or existence, expressed as a simple act of being, or say, rather, words that express being as *an act*, these are very significantly called *verbs-substantive* (*I am*), even as when a mathematician conceives a line as existing in consequence of the motion or fluxion, that is, the perpetual flowing-in, of its constituent points, but conceive it as one motionless whole, and you have then the noun.[1]

"**Arká,**" the gleam (√**ṛc,** beam; sing [praise]). [L].

Hillebrandt quotes an account of the creation in The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa ("the Sacred Teaching in a Hundred Paths,") X. 5.3. 1ff., in which it is said that the mind becoming possessed of a body beheld its 36,000 **arká** fires, which were formed of mind, and arranged in mind, and states that Eggeling remarks on that, upon the basis of the Indian commentary, that the 36,000 fires are the days of a man's life, the years being computed at 360 days and a man's life at 100 years.[2]

[1] *Times Lit. Supplement,* 7 Nov., 1929.

[2] Alf. Hillebrandt, *Aus Brāhmaṇas und Upanishaden,* pp. 24 and 171.

"the waters' son," **ápāṁ nápāt.**

Macdonell infers from this deity having three times applied to him in the Rigveda the epithet "swiftly-speeding," which in its only other occurrence in the Rigveda refers to Agni, the Fire-god, that **Apāṁ napāt** appears to represent the lightning form of Agni that lurks in the cloud. He tells us further that this deity goes back to the Indo-Iranian period, being found in the Avesta as a spirit of the waters who lives in their depths and is said to have seized the brightness in the depth of the ocean.[1]

"He steadfast in the waters stands."

There can be little doubt that the image in the speaker's mind is that of a great ox standing in water, as one of a people who were cow-farmers would see him stand on some hot day. The waters here referred to are the primeval waters. The ox is thus a representation here of the world. Specifically, the bull of the herd was the creature in this imagery, the virile productiveness of the bull presenting the abundant productiveness of the universe. Note the detailing of the image in *What Certain Creatures of the Wilderness taught Satyakāma,* Selection 7, where each of the four quarters of the world-ox is named.

The primeval waters which are here represented are regarded by these ancient philosophers as the waters we now behold still with us and still connected, and thus yet one flood, although in the great masses of the clouds and the ocean[2] and in the lesser volumes of lakes and in the runlets of the streams they are subdivided, albeit momentarily; for these allocates were observed to be perpetually passing into and out of each other. For these philosophers, with this unity of the waters ever in their mind, the waters came to be regarded as the standard image of the One.

Here, then, we have in the ox standing in the pool an image of the world as still stationed in the great primeval waters from which it arose (see the *Supremacy of the Real,* Selection 20). There is no doubt also the idea in the

[1] *A Vedic Reader for Students,* p. 69.

[2] Note the same unity and the same distribution in *Gen.* i, and for the more particular distribution described by the early Indians, see **ap** in Voc.

speaker's mind of the sacrificial horse representing the universe, and he comes to that at the close of the Upanishad as it is now put together. But it looks likely that either the more familiar image of the ox rose at this moment into his mind, or that this part of the Upanishad was of different origin from the latter part, and the two parts came eventually to be joined into one.

"*Loving to raise a crooning voice.*"

The collusion of the movement of the air with movement of the sun at rising or setting which the Upanishads pointedly make note of is well pictured by Edgell Richwood with regard to the sunrise.

> Dawn is a miracle each night debates,
> which faith may prophesy but luck dictates.
> How long can Earth, our old and heavy dame,
> keep at her tumbling trick and not fall lame?
> Yet every morning like a girl she lands,
> sweeps the hair from her eyes with windy hands,
> then, smiling at her men on hill and plain,
> dries off the dew and turns to toil again.[1]

The Western poet's comparison here of the dawn to a maiden is, of course, it may be added, a fondly dwelt-upon conception in the Rigveda. See hymns quoted in A. A. Macdonell's and in E. J. Thomas's Selections from the Rigveda.

"*For man and wife were not . . . as yet dispart.*"

BAU. 1.4. describes the Self (Ātman) as "alone, in the form of a person;" then, first attributing to him fear because he was alone, and, next, fear departing for he thought "Of what am I afraid?" proceeds to say: "Verily he had no delight. Therefore one alone has no delight. He desired a second. He was, indeed, as large as a woman and a man closely embraced. He caused that self to fall (√**pat**) into two pieces. Therefrom arose a husband (**pati**) and a wife (**patnī**). Therefore this [is true]:'Oneself (**sva**)[2] is like a half-fragment,' as Yājnavalkya used to say. Therefore this space is filled with a wife."

[1] In his *Invocations to Angels and the Happy New Year.*

[2] Note the form of this idea in *Gen.* ii, 21-23.

"*cried Bhān!*"

Here is the pychic self refusing to give itself for absorption by the Absolute which is in this Upanishad regarded as Death.

We may with the fear of absorption here depicted compare the fear of the present moment in the appeal (noted already in notes on No. 1), Robert Bridges describes the present moment addressing to the psychic life to seize it, that is, to use it to the full, so that not only it, the present moment, may live, but that the psychic life itself may live, because the present moment, when seized, is its life. The Absolute is regarded by the Western Poet in the same manner as it is our Upanishad, as the past to be absorbed into which is regarded as death:

> every moment as it flyeth, cryeth "Seize!
> Seize me er' I die! I am the Life of Life."
> *The Testament of Beauty*, ll. 1355–6.

"*immediate from himself the verses.*"

Here the Rigveda ("Knowledge put in Verses")—see *Veda* in Vocab.—is the first utterance of the Creator's voice.

This belief was succeeded by a later view which became the orthodox view, which Professor Dasgupta explains in his book on Hindu mysticism. According to this later view, he tells us, the sacred verses and the sacrificial manuals came from no author at all, human or divine. They were uncreated. They were divine in themselves. Their commands were regarded as categorical in nature and eternal in character. No one, not even such a high personality as the Original Source, uttered them. Here then was a literature existent in itself and transcendent. Its content was the secret laws of the universe. He points out how different this is from the Christian conception of Revelation of the Word, in which the existence of a living God is posited, who is able and willing to reveal his will. In this specific Hindu view there are laws but there is no lawgiver.[1]

"*formulas wherewith*
We bend the gods . . . the Yajur-Veda."[2]

Professor Bloomfield thus describes the formulas of the Yajur-Veda: "They are in prose, often more or less rhythmic,

[1] *Hindu Mysticism*, pp. 7, 8, 15. [2] See *Yajur-Veda* in Voc.

often brief and concise, mere dedications or swift prayers, accompanying an action, and sometimes hardly addressed to anyone in particular. So, for instance, 'Thee for Agni!' or 'This to Agni!' indicate that the object is dedicated to the God of Fire; or 'Thee for strength,' a brief prayer or rather magically-compelling wish that the use of a certain article by the sacrificer may give him strength. But from this brevity they swell out to long solemn litanies that betray at times such a measure of good sense as may be expected at best in these doings, but often sink to the deepest depths of imbecility, mere verbiage intent upon silly puns on the names of things that are used at the sacrifice. When an animal victim is tied to the post, we find the priest addressing to the rope these words: 'Do not turn serpent, Do not turn viper!'"[1]

"to sport in pattern moulds of music . . . the Sāma-Veda."[2]

"In the Veda of Music," Professor Bloomfield tells us, "there are no connected hymns, only more or less detached verses, borrowed in the main from the Rig-veda. Even the sense of these verses is subordinated to the music to which they are set. There are two forms of stanzas. One with the text and the musical nŏtes. The other with certain phantastic exclamatory syllables introduced, such as **om, hau, hai, hoyi** or **him**; and at the end of the stanzas certain exclamations, such as **atha, ā, īm,** and **sāt**. They remind us in a way of the Swiss and Tyrolese 'yodels,' introduced into the songs of these countries as a sort of cadenzas to heighten the musical effect."[3]

"Fame and Forcefulness," **yaśo-vīryam.**

yaśas, n. fame, honor [L].
vīryá, n. (1) 'manliness, courage, strength'; (2) (concrete) 'heroic deed' [Note **vīrá**, m. 'man,' esp. 'man of might.' Cp. Lat. vir]. [L].

"child of morning mist"

See on p. 160 Hillebrandt on **arká.**

"son of the Thundercloud"

See p. 57, ll. 31–33 and on p. 161 Macdonell on **apāṁ nápāt.**

[1] *Religion of the Veda*, p. 33.
[2] See *Sāma-Veda* in Voc.
[3] *Religion of the Veda*, p. 37.

"Here then is sacrifice . . . and there reward."

These lines embody the interpretation of Śaṁkara who comments thus: "He who is the sacrifice which is performed by means of animals is also described as the visible reward in the words 'He is the **Aśvamedha.**' Who? The answer is: He who 'shines,' viz. **Savitṛ** (the sun), who manifests the world by his splendour. 'His body,' that is, the body of him who is at the same time the reward and the sacrifice, 'is the year.' Because the sacrifice which represents him is only performed by means of fire, the reward is described by the symbol of the sacrifice. This terrestrial fire **arká** is the cause of performing the sacrifice. . . . The fire and the **Āditya** [the sun] are **arká** and **Aśvamedha,** the sacrifice and the reward. **Arká,** the terrestial fire, as the visible action, is accomplished by fire. Because the reward (**Savitṛi**) is the effect of the sacrifice, it (the reward) is described by the emblem of sacrifice. Therefore it is said **Āditya** is the **Aśvamedha.**"[1]

These Two Fires are One Divinity.

Śaṁkara explains that here we are told that " 'They,' that is **Agni** [Fire] and **Āditya** [sun], that is cause and effect, sacrifice and reward, 'are one divinity.' " The 'one divinity' here meant, he goes on to say, is Death. 'Being one before, he is now divided to correspond to the division: sacrifice, performer, effect; and thus becomes threefold; but, when the ceremonies have been accomplished, he again becomes one divinity, viz. Death. Death then represents the reward."[2]

The Triumph of Him who knows this.

Śaṁkara thus interprets: "Whosoever knows him, the **Aśvamedha,** as one deity in this manner: 'I am this death, the **Aśvamedha,** one deity; this state is gained by me as being like the Horse and the Fire;' that man overcomes the second death. That is to say, having once died, he is not born again for the second death. We read 'Death does not obtain him.' Why? Because 'Death becomes his soul,' that is the soul of him who knows death in this manner; or, death becoming thus the reward, 'he becomes one of these deities,' the which is his reward."[3]

[1] Translation in *The Twelve Principal Upanishads,* pub. by Rajaram Tukaram Tatya for the Bombay Theosophical Fund, Bombay, 1906, p. 79.
[2] *Id.,* p. 80. [3] *Id.,* p. 80.

Compare with the above these lines of E. G. A. Holmes in *The Creed of my Heart.*

I breathe the breath of the morning. I am one with the one World-Soul.
I live my own life no longer, but the life of the living Whole.
I am more than self: I am selfless: I am more than self: I am I.
I have found the springs of my being in the flush of the eastern sky.
I—the true self, the spirit, the self that is born of death—
I have found the flame of my being in the morn's ambrosial breath.
I lose my life for a season: I lose it beyond recall:
But I find it renewed, rekindled, in the life of the One, the All.[1]

3. THE EMANATIONS FROM AND THE RETURN TO ITSELF OF THE UNITIVE SELF.

TU. 2. 1–5, 8c; 3. 4b–5, 6.

For origin of the name, Partridge Disciples, of those for whom this Upanishad was intended, see **Taittirīyas** in Voc.

oṁ, see Voc.

"*existence, consciousness, the infinite.*"

These three Belvalkar and Ranade, translating **satyam, jnānam, an-antam,** 'truth, knowledge, infinity,' hold are each meant to be a complete expression of the Absolute, not simply a third part thereof. [CP. p. 388.]

"*that doth its tremor ken,*" **vipaś-cit,** 'knowing inspiration' [M].

vipas, n. 'inspiration' [M]. From √**vip,** 'be in trembling agitation'; 'tremble or shake.' [Cf. Lat. *vibrāre,* 'shake, brandish'; Eng. 'waver'; Eng. frequentative 'whiffle, veer about, blow in gusts'; 'whiffle'-tree, so called from its constant jerky motion (-tree means 'wooden bar.)'] [L].

√**cit,** (1) 'look at, notice'; (2) 'be intent upon'; (3) 'understand, know.' [L.]

***person,* puruṣa.** See Voc.

[1] *Oxford Book of English Mystical Verse.*

THE FIVE INCREASINGLY ETHEREAL PERSONS OF THE RETURN.

Belvalkar and Ranade explain these successive forms of person to be simply "allegorical representations of certain psychological conceptions." All that is meant is that man is "made up of a physical body, of vital air, of mind and intellect, and of the faculty which enables him to enjoy an ecstatic *theōria*." They protest against the occultist's discovery here of "various bodies included one within the other, as a Pandora's box, namely, the physical, astral, mental, intuitional, and beatific bodies."[1]

While sharing this view so far as the occultist's 'bodies' are concerned we would protest against merely certain psychological conditions being meant. Plainly we have successive modes of person here. We recollect Aristotle's doctrine of the three souls in a man, and how we read in Scripture of the 'will of the flesh,' 'the body of death,' 'the new man created from above,' forms of existence that are not simply psychological conditions, but modes of personality.

See summary of characters of these five persons in note on **puruṣa** in the Vocabulary.

"*And delved . . . bird-shaped . . . the altar-bed.*"

The name given to the altar was **vedi**. Originally it was a space excavated two or three inches into the ground; in which space the fire was set. Round the space was spread grass as a seat for the gods and the offerers. In later times we find altars built of bricks. The different shapes in which these might be built are mentioned as early as the Taittirīya Collection (**Saṁhita**) of Sentences, of which the Taittirīya Upanishad is the illuminative conclusion (which every Upanishad attached to a 'Collection' is designed to be). We find in course of time "a falcon-shaped altar built of square bricks or an altar of the shape of a falcon with curved wings and outspread tail; a heron-shaped altar with two feet; one of the shape of the forepart of the poles of a chariot, an equilateral triangle; another of the form of two such triangles joined at their bases; several wheel-shaped or circular altars, tortoise-shaped, etc. The area of the

[1] CP., p. 250–1.

earliest species of altars was to be $7\frac{1}{2}$ square **puruṣas**, the term **puruṣa** (man) denoting the height of a man with uplifted arms." [See J. Jolly in Hastings's *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, art. Altar.]

PRAISE OF FOOD.

"*Hence we it* '**annam**!' ['*eatin*'!'] *greet.*"

There is here a play upon the common name for food—'annam'; based upon the fact, one would suppose, that **annam** in Sanskrit has resemblance to both a past participle and a present participle. So, 'eatin',' which brings to mind both 'eaten' and 'eating,' would represent in English the play here.

THE THIRD FORM: MADE OF THE GAIN-SEEKING MIND.

"*Atharvāngirasas*," a collection that has come to be known as the Atharva-Veda.

The Atharvans and Angirases were two mythical families of priests descended from Atharvan and Angiras respectively, these two being supposed to be the authors of the Atharva-Veda. **Atharvan** is supposed to mean 'having to do with fire'; and **Angiras**, 'messenger' between gods and men (note the Greek *angelos*, 'messenger,' 'angel'). [See **Atharvan, Atharva-Veda** and **Angirases** in Voc.]

"*teaching*," **ādeśa**.

Deussen and Hume think that probably the Brāhmaṇas are here referred to, which contain 'teaching' concerning the sacrifices. [See **Brâhmaṇa** in Voc.]

THE SONG OF THE UNITIVE SELF AFTER IT HAS RETURNED TO ITSELF.

With the Song cp. the lines quoted from E. G. A. Holmes's *Creed of my Heart* on p. 166.

"*Food-eater . . . I absorb them.*"

Compare the opening lines of the same poem:

A flame in my heart is kindled by the might of the morn's pure breath
A passion beyond all passion. . . .
A love that consumes and quickens.

Also these lines from Edith Matilda Thomas's *Spirit to Spirit:*

I am the flower by the wood-path. . . .
The bird in its nest in the thicket,
The planet that leads the night-legions.
And I am the soft-dropping rain, the snow with its fluttering swarms;
The summer-day cloud on the hill-tops. . . .
The wind from the south and the west, the voice that sings courage in storms.[1]

"*law,*" **ṛta.** (See **ṛta** in Voc.)

"*I am food and the eater of food I eat.*"

That is, as Ranade puts it: "I am Death to the very God of Death."[2]

4. MACROCOSM AND MICROCOSM.

BAU. 5.5.3–4.

"**Bhūḥ! bhuvaḥ! svaḥ.**"

Vocatives, written **bhūs, bhuvas, svar**: the three sacred and mystic utterances, 'earth! atmosphere! sun!'

Bhū, 'the place of being, the world, space'; *plur.*, **bhuvas,** 'worlds, spaces,' interpreted as 'air' or 'atmosphere' when taken as the utterance between **bhūḥ!** and **svaḥ!** [√**bhū,** 'become; come into being; arise, happen, take place; exist.' Cp. Gk. *ephu,* 'became, grew'; Lat. *fuit,* 'was'; Eng. *be.*]

Thus **bhū** and **bhuvas** mean originally 'an existing' and 'these which exist,' and then 'place *or* places of existence.' So, Eng. *dwelling* and *abode,* and Lat. *mansio,* which mean originally 'a waiting,' 'an abiding,' and then 'an abiding place, mansion.'

Svar, pronounced **suar** in the Veda, 'the sun.' [Cp. Gk. *Seir-ios, Seir,* 'sun, dog-star'; *sel-ēnē,* 'moon'; Lat. *ser-ēnus,* 'bright'; *sōl,* 'sun'; Eng. *sweal,* 'burn, glow, waste away by heat,' whence *sweltry* or *sultry.*] [L.]

"*these do answer each to each.*"

This reminds us of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa's (1401–1464) statement that each thing in the universe is a special contraction of the whole (*omnis res actu existens contrahit universa, ut sint actu id quod est*), and more completely than

[1] *Oxford Book of English Mystical Verse.* [2] CS., p. 100.

in other beings does the world mirror itself in man; briefly put, man is "the world in miniature" (a *parvus mundus*).[1]

5. THE OPEN WAY AT DEATH.

BAU. 5.5.2.

"See This from That his life-breaths bring,
While That sends rays on This to cling."
"Life-breaths," **prāṇa**. See Voc.

This act of the sun is presented on a monument of King Aken-aten (Amenhotep IV), about 1370 B.C. in Egypt. Rays ending in hands are sculptured, stretching down upon the King from the radiant disk (**aten**) as he presents offerings. From the disk and also from the hand that is immediately in front of the King hangs the **ankh**, the symbol of life.[2]

It is well to point out, however, that, while in the section of the Brāhmaṇa that is here presented a person is depicted as resident in the sun, the religion portrayed on the Egyptian monument was protestant against such conception. Flinders Petrie tells us that the Aten, the radiant disk, was "entirely separate from the theology of Rā, the sun-god. The disk was never represented by any human or animal figure, and by the devotee of the Aten the worship of Rā was proscribed. The object of worship indeed was not so much the disk as it was the rays or radiant energies that proceeded from the sun, these being shown [as in the monument above described], each ending in hands that gave life and dominion and accepted offerings." This purified form of devotion connected with the sun was "restricted," he tells us, "within half a century or less, the first traces appearing under Amenhotep III, the full development under his son Aken-aten [depicted on the monument already referred to], and the end of it under Tut-ankh-amon."[3]

The idea of hands that touch is found in connexion with the moon in one of the *Seven Hundred Strophes* in the Māhārāshtrī dialect collected by King Hāla, who probably

[1] Ueberweg-Heinze on Nicolas Cusanus in *Gesch. d. Phil.*, III, 50.

[2] The monument is pictured in article "Aegypten" in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*,[1] edited by F. M. Schiele.

[3] Article, "Egyptian Religion," p. 248, by W. Flinders Petrie, in Hastings's *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

reigned in the first or second century of our era,[1] in this entreaty of a love-struck maiden to the moon:

O holy lucent Forehead-sign
And Crown, Thou Moon, of Heaven above,
On me too lay the shining hands
Wherewith thou nearer drawest my love.[2]

6. THE CREED OF ŚĀṆḌILYA.

CU. 3.14.

"purpose," **kratu**. See p. 204.

The comprehensive power we find here attributed to the soul in the Creed of Śāṇḍilya is well expressed by Loerke, one of the so-called cosmo-centric school of poets in Germany after the Great War, in this verse of his, which evidently depicts the confusion of the nations that followed that catastrophe:

Peoples like a surging main,[3]
So much blood and so much pain!
Tumult vast! yet doth it all
In one's loneliness befall.[4]

We may notice also how distinctly Emerson's description of the Soul within us as being properly what he calls the Over-Soul, agrees with the above teaching of Śāṇḍilya: "All goes to show that the soul in man is not an organ at all, but animates and exercises the organs; it is not a faculty, but a light; it is not the intellect or the will, but the master of the intellect and the will—is the vast background of our being, in which these lie—an immensity that is not possessed and that cannot be possessed. Man is thus a stream whose source is hidden, his being is descending into him from whence he knows not. . . . I am constrained every moment to acknowledge a higher origin for events than the will I call mine. As with events, so is it with thoughts.

"The Supreme Critic on all the errors of the past and the present, and the only Prophet of that which must be, is that Great Nature in which we rest as the earth lies in the soft arms of the atmosphere; that Unity, that Over-soul, within which every man's particular being is contained and

[1] Helmuth von Glasenapp in Otto von Glasenapp's *Indische Gedichte*, p. xxv.
[2] Otto von Glasenapp's *Indische Gedichte*, p. 71.
[3] *Steigender, stürzender, Völker beharrendes Bild.*
[4] In "Hinter dem Horizont" in *Der Längste Tag* (Berlin: Fischer).

made one with all other; that Common Heart of which all sincere conversation is the worship, to which all right action is the submission; that overpowering reality which confutes our tricks and talents, and constrains every one to pass for what he is.

"Let man learn the revelation of all nature and all thought to his heart; this, namely, that the Highest dwells with him, that the sources of nature are in his own mind when the sentiment of duty is there."

Such a doctrine as Śāṇḍilya's seems to be in Alliotta, the Italian philosopher's, mind, also, as Crespi describes his teaching: "Religion remains for Alliotta as the immediate experience each soul possesses of its essential unity with the whole of Being, as the longing after ever more intimate forms of such unity."[1]

In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (X. 7. 34–37), considered by Helmuth von Glasenapp[2] to have to be composed about the ninth century A.D., we have this unity with the whole of Being depicted as possessed by Krishṇa, whom that Purāṇa specially celebrates among the incarnations of the god Vishṇu. Yashodā was the wife of the shepherd Nanda and the foster-mother of Krishna, and how she regarded the child she fostered is thus described:

> Took once Yashódā Krishna on her lap to rest.
> The child would drink and lovingly she gave to him her breast.
> Then drank the child and oped his mouth—a lightsome yawn.
> Caressing him the mother then his fair face gazed upon.
> O wonderful! in that one look she all the world did see,
> Air sun moon stars beneath heaven's canopy,
> And sea earth hill and stream, e'en all that earth doth hold,
> Yea, everything that rests or stirs she saw itself unfold;
> Clear-eyed yet trembling viewed in that one moment all;
> Then let her eye-lids, love-and-laughter weighted, fall.[3]

Compare also this of Crashaw's entitled *On the Blessed Virgin's Bashfulness.*

> That on her lap she casts her humble eye,
> 'Tis the sweet pride of her humility.

[1] Crespi, *Contemporary Thought of Italy*, p. 219.

[2] Helmuth u. Glasenapp's Introduction in his father Otto's book, *Indische Gedichte aus vier Jahrtausenden.*

[3] Anglicising of Otto Glasenapp's translation in the said book.

The fair star is well fixed, for where, O where!
Could she have fixed it on a fairer sphere?
'Tis heaven, 'tis heaven she sees, heaven's God there is;
She can see heaven and ne'er lift her eyes.
This New Guest to her eyes new laws hath given:
'Twas once "Look up," 'tis now "look down" to heaven.

The difference between the doctrine of Śāṇḍilya and the later doctrine of Śaṁkara, who, born 788 A.D., systematised and promulgated the doctrine he regarded as the Vedānta (the end or essential doctrine of the Veda) and whose writings are the canonical documents of what is called Vedānta to-day, is noted by E. W. Hopkins, who points out that Śaṁkara taught that the One Spirit alone exists, and that accordingly the individual spirit is nothing else than the passing impress of the One Spirit, while the teaching here ascribed to Śāṇḍilya depicts the individual spirit to be in the present order distinct from the Supreme Spirit, although ultimately to be absorbed into it.[1]

7. WHAT CERTAIN CREATURES OF THE WILDERNESS TAUGHT SATYAKĀMA.

CU. 4.4–9.

The Bull, the Fire, the Swan, the Diver-Bird.

These are creatures a tender of cattle in the wilderness would be well acquainted with. As creatures in intimate contact with the great world around them, in contrast to man who dwells so much in shelter, and consequently supposed, in the bent of ancient thought, to have a deeper insight into nature than man has, these successively announce here to the herdsmen the contents and the name of each quarter of the **brahman**, the Spirit, the mysterious invisible force of which the Upanishad teachers maintained the world to be the manifestation.

The Bull.

The great world with its wonderful productivity is well conceived by these thinkers of ancient Hindustan as the Bull, the strongly productive creature, pictured gigantic, standing firm upon its four feet in the swirl of the

[1] E. W. Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 221, note.

primeval waters which still circulate, and in which in the beginning the earth was formed (see Selection 2 [BAU. 1.2], p. 58).

Pāda, 'foot' (cp. Lat. *pē(d)s, pĕdis*), is the word frequently used as here to designate the limb of a quadruped and so 'a fourth part,' 'a quarter.' Compare Lanman's remark that we in English conversely use 'a quarter,' a fourth part, to designate a limb.

What of the Swastika? It is, of course, Sanskrit: **su,** prob. akin to **āyú** 'lively,' from √i, 'go'; and to Gk. *eu-*, 'strongly' which has become generalised into *eu*, 'well' [L]; + **ás-ti,** 'is' (cp. Gk. *es-ti*, 'is,' 'exists'; Eng. 'is' [L]); and + the adjectival suffix **ka.** How far does it go back? Are we to gather its meaning from the image here of the universe as a Bull; that is to say, that the Swastika's four feet are the four feet of the Universe, the composure and progress (well-being, **swastiká**) of which is assured for him to the wearer of the swastika? True, a bull has not human feet as the swastika has, but hoofs; yet the Macrocosm, came to be set in tally with the Microcosm, In the Puruṣa-hymn of the Rigveda (10.90), we have the world conceived as a giant, whose eye is the sun, the air his chest, and so on. (See **puruṣa** in Voc.)

"*supported,*" "*Possessing a support*" [H]. Sanskrit, **ā-yát-ana-vant.**

ā-yát-ana, n. a support fr. **ā-yat,** reach to, attain, fr. √**yat,** join [perh. orig. 'reach out after']; +**ā,** 'hither,' 'from' (first 'all the way from,' then 'all the way unto'. [Cp. Lat. *ā.*] [L.]

". . . *cloud.*" Sanskrit, **sam-udra,** literally 'gathering of the waters." See **sam-udra** in Voc.

"*I see thee shine like Spirit-Knower.*"

Thus we find, as Belvalkar and Ranade point out, the worship of the four quarters of Brahman, with the understanding of them as here laid down, is regarded as preparation for further knowledge of the Brahman.[1]

We are not told what the further teaching was that Hāridrumata gave to Satyakāma, but we may infer that it

[1] CP., p. 390.

was the knowledge, which we are informed in the passage immediately following, Satyakāma declared to his own pupil when he himself had become a teacher. Yet what we find given there is not that high instruction regarding the Self which we find in the supreme parts of the Upanishads.[1]

8. HOW SPIRIT BECAME THE ALL.

BAU. 1.4.10.

"*Knowledge-of-Spirit,*" **brahma-vidyā**, is explained in the comments brought forward by S. C. Vasu, on p. 86 of the edition of this Upanishad in the *Sacred Books of the Hindus*, edited by B. D. Basu, I.M.S., retired, to mean 'the direct perception of God as opposed to belief in God.'

Vāma-deva, a seer, son of Gotama, and composer of the Fourth Maṇḍala [division or book] of the Rig-Veda. [M.]

Manu, the first of men living on the earth, progenitor of mankind. [VM.]

9. THE SELF CREATIVE.

BAU. 1.4.5, 6.

"*Churning with his lips.*"

Madhu, the elder brother of the great commentator Sāyana, and, like Sāyana, minister to Bukka I (1350–79), wrote a Commentary on the Upanishad from which this selection is taken. Bukka belonged to a family which, throwing off the Moslem yoke in the earlier half of the fourteenth century, founded the dynasty of Vijaya-nagara ('city of victory'), now Hampi (in ruins), on the Tunga-bhadrā, in the Bellary district. Madhu died as abbot of the monastery of Śṛngeri.[2]

We quote from an edition of this Upanishad, p. 73, in B. D. Basu's *Sacred Books of the Hindus*, Madhu's comment on this description of the creative act of the Self: "Thinking 'Let me create food and the eater of food,' he churned his two lips with the palms of his two hands. From that rubbing of the lips with the palms of the hands there arose fire from inside his mouth and hands."

[1] CP., p. 222. [2] A. A. Macdonell's *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 275.

In a parenthesis in this translation of Madhu's Commentary it is explained that "This was the generation of the fire of digestion."

Soma, m. 'extract' (from √**su**, to extract [L.]): the juice as extracted with much ceremony from the internodia or shoots (**aṁśu**)[1] of a certain plant by a company met together to worship the gods. What the plant was is not known. We learn from the Rig-veda that both the plant and its juice were of brown, ruddy, or tawny colour. It is described as growing on the mountains and in the waters. Already it was prepared and celebrated in the community of the Indo-Europeans that settled in Persia before the detachment left that settled in India, among whom were the Rig-veda poets. The mysterious effect of the juice on mind and energy led to its being regarded by those poets as a divine draught that conferred immortality.[2]

"*Which doth in those who quaff, etc.*"

These lines are inserted by the present writer as a paraphrase of RV. 8.48. where the worshippers gathered together exclaim, "We have drunk Soma. We have become immortal. We have entered into light. We have known the gods."[3]

creation, **sṛṣṭi**, f. a letting-forth, discharge; *ordinary meaning*, creation [M.]. From √**sṛj**, let loose, dart, hurl; throw, pour out (streams, rain); (discharge from one's self *and so*) procreate, engender, create. [L.]

super-creation [H.], higher creation [M.], **ati-sṛṣṭi**. **ati**, *adv.* across, beyond, past, over, *as verbal prefix*; *in compounds*, to excess, excessive; *as preposition*, beyond, over. [Cp. Greek *eti*, further, besides; Lat. *et*, besides, and.] [L.]

"*He, mortal, hath immortals brought him forth.*"

The significance of this with regard to art is thus stated in a note on this passage on p. 71 of B. D. Basu's edition of this Upanishad: "The art is immortal, the artist mortal. The production of an artist is therefore an **ati-sṛṣṭi**."

[1] **áṁśa**, m. (that which one gets, i.e.) one's portion; *and so, generalised*, portion, part, [√**aś**, get]. **aṁśú**, m. juicy intermedium *or* shoot of the Soma-plant. [L.]

[2] VM., pp. 104–115. [3] VM., p. 109.

10. THE INSTRUCTION GIVEN BY UDDĀLAKA TO HIS SON ŚVETAKETU.

CU. 6.

Uddālaka.

One of the most prominent teachers of the Vedic Period, a Brahmin of the Kuru-pancāla people who occupied the upper plain of the Jumna and Ganges, the teacher of Yājnavalkya. His son Śvetaketu is reported by Āpastamba, a teacher, to have become in the later time in which he lived an **avara** (later authority).[1] (See **Uddālaka Āruneya** in Voc.

Only Being in the beginning (CU. 6. 2.1).

Literal translation: "simply Being (**sat eva**), simply One (**ekam eva**) and so without-a-second (**a-dvitīyam**) was this world at first."

"*simply*," **eva**, for which see p. 189.

Here we have the foundation axiom of Hindu religion. It has proved, if taken mathematically, a difficult foundation on which to build the world. If Being be a mathematical One, then all plurality is a delusion. This came to be taught in later days, finding its final and most exact proclaimer in Śaṁkara.[2] But evidently for Uddālaka Being is not abstract.[3] Nor is the One mathematical. It 'bethinks itself' (p. 101). It recognises itself as 'this living self' (p. 102). Although certain objects (e.g. the sun) are simply compounds of the elements, the elements themselves are evidently real. They beget one the other, and Being enters them 'with this living self,' and, dwelling in them, makes out name and form. Apparently clay, iron, copper exist, although objects made thereof are ruled out, as being simply 'puttings of a name.' Uddālaka's successor cleared his master's teaching by proclaiming the Self to be the core of Being, the inner thread, by being strung on which the world and every item therein exists.

"*Name and Form*," **nāma-rūpe**, one word of dual number, composed of **nāma**, 'name,' as in English, and **rūpa**, 'outward look' or 'appearance,' as well 'color' as 'form' or 'shape' [L].

[1] *Vedic Index*, arts. "Uddālaka" and "Kuru." [2] See p. 173.

[3] That Being (**sat**) is not abstract in Hindu thought in general, see sat in Voc.

"goblins," **yaksa**. See p. 30.

The *Śata-patha Brāhmaṇa*, 11.2.3, thus describes the advent of Name and Form:

"Verily, Spirit was this world at the beginning. It created the gods. After it created the gods it set them over these [three] worlds, Agni over this world, Vāyu over the air, and Sūrya over the heaven. . . . But It itself went into the half beyond. . . . After it went into the half beyond it thought 'How can I now into these worlds descend?'

"Into these worlds it descended by means of two, that is to say, by means of both Form (**rūpa**) and Name (**nāma**). Therefore to whatsoever thing a name belongs, that is its Name; and what thing has no name, and one knows its form and says 'Its Form is so,' that is its form. For this world extends just as far as name and form do.

"These two are the two mighty dreads [**a-bhva**, literally 'non-being'] of Spirit. He who knows these two mighty dreads, a mighty dread himself becomes.

"Also, these are the two mighty sprites [**yakṣa**] of Spirit. He who knows these two mighty sprites, himself a mighty sprite becomes.

"Of these two the more powerful is Form, for where there is the Name [of a thing] that is tantamount to its Form. He who knows that more powerful [of these two] becomes himself more powerful than him over whom he wishes more powerful to be."[1]

Heat, Water, Food.

Belvalkar and Ranade explain that Heat (**tejas**) signifies the invigorating, energetic principle; the Waters (**āpas**)—all liquid existence; Food (**anna**)—whatever is solid. They point out that thus the primary elements of the world according to Uddālaka are only these three: (1) Energy or force, prominently manifested in fire and light, (2) liquid existence, and (3) solid existence; and that, further, according to his teaching later on in this Upanishad, evolution progressed from what is fine to what is coarse.

It would seem, our two scholars go on to say, that Uddālaka thought that all the objects of phenomenal existence were the product of a suitable and judicious

[1] Quoted in Deussen, *Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanishads*, p. 259–.

combination of these three principles, fire (energy), water (what is liquid), food (what is solid or earthy), informed and invigorated by Being (spirit); and that objects were known to be more fiery, more watery, or more earthy, according as the principle of fire water or earth predominated. Thus we here meet the doctrine according to which there was a portion of everything in everything—except Being, which alone stands outside and is transcendent. In this scheme as a partite scheme we see the basis on which the doctrine of five primary elements—ether, air, fire, water, earth—was taught in later Indian thought and in early Greek philosophy" [CP. p. 226]. There is more particularly, when we note the theory of the inclusion of all in all, the striking coincidence with the doctrine of Anaxagoras (who lived from about 499–8 to 428–7 B.C. [Ueberweg-Heinze]) of Klazomenai, an island-town on the Gulf of Smyrna, according to whom the smallest portions ('seeds' he called them) of matter contained a portion of everything, that is, of all the opposites, although in different proportions. Because his atoms thus contained a portion of everything Anaxagoras called them **homoiomerē** ('like parts').[1]

"*That which is the finest essence: that which hath that* [*finest essence*] *as its soul this whole World is. . . . That are Thou, O Śvetaketu.*"

"*finest essence,*" **aṇimā**[2]; has-that-as-its-soul **etad-ātmyam**; **etad**, 'that'; **ātmyam**, 'possessing as soul (**ātmā**).'

This stanza is the refrain of each of the Riddles that follow. In the light of the preceding instruction it may be put in this form: That finest essence, namely, Being, out of which proceeded heat, water, food, which constitute this whole world, is (which might have been inferred, seeing it thus is the source of all) the soul or self of this whole world. That finest essence alone is real (which, if we carry logic to conclusion, has indeed been already said, seeing it is called 'Being').

That is the Self.

Professor Schayer tells us that the Self (**ātmā**) really meant for these ancient thinkers simply 'myself.' That at all events is a better translation, he says, of **ātmā** than

[1] See John Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 306. [2] For aṇimán, see p. 39.

'the Self' understood in the abstract significance the term has come to possess, after these many centuries of thought, for thinkers of to-day.[1] Yājnavalkya speaks of the intelligential self as 'this person here, the light of the heart,' laying his hand the while upon his breast [p. 118 (BAU., 4.3.7.)]. Aśvapati stretches his fingers across his forehead to indicate where the self that is common to all men resides (p. 245 CU., 5.18.1.)]. Keeping in mind the warning of Schayer's, we venture thus to paraphrase the teaching of Uddālaka to his son: "That finest essence, that which is the Self of the World and alone Real and is myself: That art Thou, to whom I speak"; or, in other words, "Myself is thy-self". The sum of all which assertion is that the Self of the World, of him who thinks, and of each human being around us is the one and the self-same Self and it alone is real.

SECOND RIDDLE (CU. 6.10).

"gathered waters," **sam-udra**. See pp. 161 and 208.

THIRD RIDDLE (CU. 6.11).

Ranade thus explains this riddle: "The subtle essence which Uddālaka here declares to underly all phenomena is, considered biologically, the supreme life-principle which gives life to the universe. The branches of a tree may die and yet the tree lives; but when the tree dies, the branches die also. Similarly the universe may vanish, but God remains; but God cannot vanish, and hence the latter alternative is impossible."[2]

FOURTH RIDDLE (CU. 6.12).

ny-ag-ródha, m. *Ficus Bengalensis*, banyan tree.

ny-ag-rodha means 'growing, bent down, into.' From **ní**, prep. 'down; in, into' (cp. Eng. *ne-ther*, *be-nea-th* +**ag** (√**ac** or **anc**, bend) + √**rudh**, 'grow' (cp. Lat. *rud-is*, fem. 'rod, staff') [L].

Ranade points out that the teacher here declares that it is of the very subtle essence which his pupil "does not perceive" in the seed that the great **ny-ag-rodha** tree is made. So does he teach that here is an existence that "can be grasped only by faith." Further, it is declared that this subtle, unseen essence that displays itself in the great tree

[1] Schayer, *Jahrbuch der Schopenhauer Gesellschaft*, 1928. [2] CS., p. 55.

is to be "identified with the Self, and his pupil must identify himself with it. So we see made clear in this parable the limitation also of a merely cosmological conception of the underlying essence of all things. We are warned that cosmology must invoke the aid of psychology, and that it is only when we suppose that the same subtle essence underlies both the world of nature and the world of mind that we find the whole Universe to be one."[1]

A. M. Church thus describes *Ficus Bengalensis*: "Of Sub-Himalya and S. India. It is greatly planted, and grows to 100 ft. high with descending aerial roots as 'props.' Given time there seems to be no limit to the lateral extension (assisted). Calcutta tree, seedling of 1782, 100 yards diam. and 464 props, 1900. Nerbudda tree, covering nearly 1 sq. mile. It attains a great age, 2200 years being recorded. Fruit small, globose, half to three-quarters inch, scarlet when ripe."[2]

Fifth Riddle (cu. 6.13).

This Riddle Professor Ranade explains thus: "Metaphysically, the subtle essence underlying phenomena, which is identical with the Self, pervades all. As salt may pervade every particle of water into which it is put, so the Ātman fills every nook and cranny of the universe. There is nothing that does not live in the Ātman."[3]

Sixth Riddle (cu. 6.14).

Here we are taught that a teacher is necessary.

"*Gāndhāras.*"

The later form of the name Gāndhāris which designates in the Rigveda the most north-westerly of the many Āryan tribes that are mentioned.[4] The good wool of their sheep is referred to, and it is related that they took part in 'the great battle' of 'the ten Kings'[5] against the chief of a tribe apparently settled to the east of the Paruṣṇī (Rāvi, Irāvatī). Zimmer, we are told in Macdonell and Keith's *Vedic Index*, considers that they were settled on the south bank of the Kubhā (which is no doubt identical with Kabul river of

[1] CS., pp. 55 and 257.
[2] *Introduction to the Systematy of Indian Trees*, p. 40.
[3] CS., p. 55.
[4] Macdonell in *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. II, p. 223. [5] *Id.*, p. 222.

to-day) down to the point where it joins the Indus, and then down the side of the Indus for some distance. Their name is still preserved in the form Kandahār.[1]

EIGHTH RIDDLE (CU. 6.16): THE INVISIBLE PROTECTION IN LIFE'S ORDEAL.

This brief description of the Riddle is given by Ranade: "Viewed from the moral point of view the Ātman is truth. One who makes alliance with truth, makes alliance with the Ātman also."[2] And Belvalkar and Ranade thus put its lesson in more detail: "We are taught here that the Self and Reality are identical. It is only when we 'cover ourselves with the truth of the Ātman' that we are able to face boldly the ordeal of life. If we cover ourselves with unreality, there is no hope for us. It is Truth, therefore, which ultimately matters. Truth is identical with the subtle essence of the universe, and that is the Ātman. 'That THOU art' is the recurring instruction which Āruṇi gives to his son Śvetaketu."[3]

Note, as supporting this identification of truth with the essence of the universe, what Dr. Crespi tells us is the teaching of the Italian philosopher Antonio Aliotta (*The Idealistic Reaction against Science*, 1912): "Aliotta has it that while there are levels and degrees of reality and truth, the higher including the lower and resting thereon, truth itself is the one ever-receding and yet ever-impelling final goal of life in each of its myriad forms."[4]

11. THE BIRD OF PARADISE.

Muṇḍ. 3.1–3; ŚU. 4.6–7; Maitri. 6.18b.

"*The Song*" is RV. 10.164.20.

The bird that "eats the sweet fruit" is the Self as realised in Individual separateness. The bird that "without eating looks on" is the Transcendent Self.

"*the dark-purple berries*," berry, **pip-pal-a**, m.

pippala is found, Macdonnell and Keith tell us, in two passages in the Rigveda as meaning 'berry' with a mystic significance, but with no certain reference to the berry of a

[1] Macdonnell in *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. II, p. 222.
[2] CP., p. 55. [3] *Id.*, p. 230.
[4] *Contemporary Thought of Italy*, by Angelo Crespi, 1926, p. 219.

fig-tree. They point out, however, that in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa it perhaps means the berry of the fig-tree, called the Berry-Tree (Peepul) in India to-day (the *Ficus Religiosa*). It was no doubt a common tree in North India in these ancient days as it still is to-day. It is the tree still preserved in Buddh Gayā,. where the Buddha received his Awakening. A. H. Church describes it as a wide-spreading tree with foliage like a poplar's, tremulous, with long drip-tips, 1–2 inch, and with fruit half-inch in diameter and of a dark purple colour.[1]

The translator here has accordingly assumed that the Peepul is the tree intended in the Old Ballad, and describes its berries as dark purple.

"*this Person's sad woe*," 'person,' **puruṣa**. (See Voc., p. —.)

"*Spirit-source*," **brahma-yoni**, literally 'Spirit-womb.' In B. D. Basu's edition of the Muṇḍaka with Madhu's commentary, 'the cause, the source, of Brahmā,' the clause in which the word occurs is translated 'the Person from whom Brahmā comes out.' This substitution of the personal **Brahmā** for the impersonal or semi-personal **bráhman** is in accordance with Madhu's theology. For Madhu see p. 175. For **bráhman** and **brahmā**, see Voc. See also p. 30.

Yóni, m.f. lap; womb *or* birthplace ['the holder' of the born or unborn babe, √**yu**, hold.] [L].

"*Poised safe above sund'rance.*" 'sund'rance,' **a-vy-ayam**, 'the Inconvertable' [CP]; 'the Imperishable' [H], from **a**, negative prefix + **vi**, prep. 'apart, asunder, away, out' + √i, 'go.'

In the previous section (2, 1.2) of the Muṇḍaka Upanishad from which this selection is taken the superiority of the Person to the **a-vy-ayam** is stated:

> Heavenly (**divya**) without form (**a-mūrtta**) is the Person (**purusa**).
> He is without and within, unborn.
> Without breath (**a-prāṇa**) without mind (**a-manas**), pure (**śubhra**).
> Higher than the **a-vy-ayam**.

[1] *Introduction to the Systematy of Indian Trees*, p. 40.

"shaken off good and evil."

It will be the hope of those who find in Upanishad teaching so much that enlightens, that here is meant only that superiority of the Supreme according to which out of personal will the Supreme decides the good and the evil and accordingly reigns above both: but we are to remember that there runs throughout the teaching of the Forest Fathers the strange and subversive doctrine that the highest condition of the Self is a condition of such thorough passivity that it is indifferent to either the good or the evil that it does. We quote on p. 185 the opinion of our two so often cited Indian scholars with regard to that doctrine.

The Italian philosopher Croce, as his teaching is summed up by Crespi, has it indeed that "each distinct concept—the beautiful, the true, the useful, the good—is the concrete synthesis of two concepts, two opposites, each of which, taken by itself, is a mere abstraction and is real only in synthesis with the other." But, he insists, Crespi points out, that a struggle is going on of the positive over its negation. Thus "beauty has ugliness, its opposite, as an element within itself, which it seeks to overcome, truth has falsehood within itself and also is the overcoming of falsehood; worth is the overcoming of worthlessness; goodness the overcoming of evil. That is to say, opposition is not between the different moments of the life of the mind, but within each of them, just as life carries death, its negation, within itself, and is the struggle to overcome it; while both life and death have really no meaning apart from their opposites."[1]

Croce has it that this struggle is ever going on, reality thus growing out of itself in infinite time. Reality thus for him is History. In this Upanishad we have it on the contrary displayed as the Static. In such a presentation the danger is that the true relation and action of the opposites to each other, if Reality in its true nature is to be attained, may be forgotten. H. R. Mackintosh censures McTaggart for wasting time and ingenuity in seeking to find in Omnipotence "the power of combining two operations which are both metaphysically and ethically incongruous."[2]

[1] *Contemporary Thought of Italy*, 1926, p. 70.

[2] In *The Christian Apprehension of God.*

12. THE INSTRUCTION YĀJNAVALKYA GAVE TO JANAKA, KING OF THE VIDEHAS.

BAU. 4.3–4.

The King's Question (bau. 4.3. 2–6).

"The Self, O King."

As Ranade points out [CS., p. 40] Yājnavalkya has here adopted the regressive method of instruction, which "takes the form of many successive questions, every new question carrying us behind the answer to the previous question." When Janaka asked what is the light of man, he answered that it was the sun. Janaka had then to retire behind answer after answer of the sage—from Sun to Moon, from Moon to Fire, and so on, until his ceasing to repeat the question shows him that the sage had at last given him the true answer, the Self, which exists behind all, the Light-in-itself.

Ranade thus summarises the teaching of this section: "The Ātman is the ultimate light of man; all other lights are lights by sufferance. When Ātman is realised as the light of man, one reaches self-consciousness" [CS. p. 57].

The To and Fro Movement of the Intelligential Self (bau. 4. 3.7).

"Among the senses." (See **prāṇa** in Voc.)

The Root beneath all Divergence (bau. 4.3.22).

". . . Nor thief, a thief; doth bear He who an embryo's death hath enterprised, that horror There no more."

Belvalkar and Ranade describe the absence here of differentiation in the beatific condition as "the dangerline of Upanishad ethics." They remark that "to say that the Ātman [that is, the Self] dies not, is legitimate. To say that weapons cannot cut him or fire burn him is only a legitimate varying of the phrase. But to argue that therefore the muderer is no murderer—as is done in the Kaushītaki Upanishad ('Whoso were to know me [that is, Indra, representing the Self], not by any action of his whatsoever can his world be injured; not by murdering his mother or his father, not by stealing or by killing an embryo. Nor can anybody observe any pallor or darkening of his face even though he were to do what is ordinarily regarded as

sin or crime.' [Kaush. 3.1.].)—and therefore nobody is really responsible for his actions, is to carry this doctrine to a point which, if seriously preached, would be subversive of all established social institutions and religious sacraments. And that is exactly what things were drifting to at the time when this teaching was promoted."[1]

Perhaps at first sight we will see in the passage before us simply such a description of the condition beyond the bourne of space-time as is given by Job, when he cursed the day of his birth, wishing he had died from the womb and so had "slept and been at rest . . . where the wicked cease from troubling [that is, as Davidson explains 'from the unquiet of their own evil'] and the weary are at rest; where the prisoners are at ease together and hear not the voice of the taskmaster; where are the small and great, and the servant is free from his master" (Job 3. 11–19), that is, a condition in which the Self is resting in itself, free from trouble. But, while the Book of Job has as its great theme the sense of the moral imperfection that haunts a man as he considers the holiness of God, we find Yājnavalkya later on, when he describes the *Independence of the Self* (p. 129), teach just what is so dramatically taught in the passage our two Indian scholars quote from the Kaushītaki, that a man who has attained to the true height of the Self is quite indifferent as to the good or the evil that he does.

THE MAN WHOSE WORLD IS SPIRIT (BAU. 4.3.32).

"*As gathered flood,*" **salila**, 'flood, surge' (M); fr. √sr (p. 227.)

"*One unbroken.*" This is a paraphrase of **a-dvaita**, 'without duality.'

For the idea see p. 161. It is illustrated by the following verse of the Bhagavad-gītā[2]: "He whom all desires enter as the waters enter the full and firm-established sea, wins peace; not so the desirer of desires" (BG. 2.70).

W. D. P. Hill, from whose translation of the Bhagavad-gītā the above lines are taken, explains in his Introduction

[1] CP., p. 399.

[2] Composed, according to W. D. P. Hill (*The Bhagavad-gītā*, p. 18), not later than 150 B.C., that is, some five centuries after the expiry of the Upanishad period. Upanishad ideas have been perpetually in the Hindu mind since they were promulgated, in fact, form the very core and marrow thereof.

(p. 61) that this refers to "the placid serenity of the true Ascetic. The things of sense, the desires that enter the mind affect him not. As rivers pour their waters into an ocean that yet remains unmoved and ever the same, so the influx of desires cannot move him."

THE SOURCE OF CONSCIOUSNESS (BAU. 4.3.23–31).

Note as throwing light upon these announcements the description by Angelo Crespi of Bernardino Varisco's philosophy:

"Being on the one hand must be: it cannot but persist in existing. The thought of Being as no longer being is a self-contradictory thought. On the other hand, Being exists only as the common feature of all other realities, i.e. of its determinations, just as the triangle exists only in its determinations, the isosceles scalene and equilateral triangles. That means that it is necessary that there should be determinations of Being in order that Being may be. Without these determinations there would be nothing. On the other hand, the existence of these determinations follows out of the necessity that Being, which cannot but be, should realise itself by emerging from its indeterminate and purely logical existence and by determining itself so-and-so as the system of the universe." [A. Crespi: *Contemporary Thought of Italy* (1926), p. 227.]

THE BEATIFIC CALCULUS (BAU. 4.3.33).

Belvalkar and Ranade report with approval this title.

"Elves" is Professor Helmuth Glasenapp's translation of **gandharvas**, "the singers of Indra's court," as Lanman describes them. Originally there was only one gandharva, and Lanman conjectures that he was the deity of the moon. (See **gandharva** in the Vocabulary.)

A clause—"and of him who is learned in the Vedas, who is without crookedness and is free from desire"—closes the description of each of the last three blisses. It is evidently an insertion into the text, and is therefore omitted in our translation.

In *The Soul at Death* (BAU. 4.3. 35–38) there is a paragraph (BAU. 4.3.37), which is regarded by Deussen as an insertion. It is accordingly kept by itself and

translated on p. 149 under the title *The Homage of All things to him who in All things sees the Self.*

BECOMING ONE (BAU. 4.4.2*a*.).

The criticism in brackets on the neighbours' remarks is by Deussen's advice inserted in accordance with the teaching of *The Source of Consciousness*, p. 121 (BAU. 4.3.23–31).

THE SETTING-OUT TO ACQUIRE ANOTHER BODY (BAU. 4.4.2*b*).

"*the surge that held him thrall before.*" (See saṁsāra in Voc.)

THE ACQUIREMENT OF ANOTHER BODY (BAU. 4.4.3–7).

Upon this section Ranade has this striking comment: "This passage is important from various points of view. It tells us, in the first place, that a Soul finds out its future body before it leaves its former one: in fact, it seems that the passage calls in question a 'disembodied' existence. Then again, it tells us that the Soul is a creative entity, and, in Aristotelian fashion, that it creates a body as a goldsmith creates an ornament of gold. Then again, the passage says that a Soul is like a Phoenix which at every change of body takes on a newer and more beautiful form. Next, it regards the Soul as amenable at every remove to the law of karman, and tells us that it receives a holy body if its actions have been good, and a sinful body if its actions have been bad."[1]

The successive embodying of the Self by the Self is thus alluded to by Kālidāsa.[2]

> Sight charming dost thou see, entrancing tones perceive,
> Thyself indeed deem blest, and yet most strangely grieve?
> Unwitting, thou, in spirit, friendship old rememberest,
> Out of some earlier life of thine, deep-rooted in they breast.

With this doctrine of the acquirement by the soul of another body, and thus its continuance after death in this

[1] CS., p. 156.

[2] "The greatest poet of the country of the Ganges, in whom Indian poetic art attains its perfection. In all probability he lived in the first half of the fifth century A.D. in the court of the Emperor Gupta, who then ruled a mighty kingdom in the east of India." [Helmuth von Glasenapp in his father Otto von Glasenapp's *Indische Gedichte aus vier Jahrtausenden*, from whose book these lines are taken, translated by the author of this work.]

world, compare the teaching of what is called, on account of its author being unknown, the "Orphan Quotation":

"I expect to pass through this world but once; any good thing therefore that I can do, or any kindness that I can show, to my fellow creatures, let me do it now; let me not defer it or neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again."

DESIRE IS THE SOURCE OF ACTS (BAU. 4.4.5*c*).

"*deed; Himself fallen-in-with-that is then his meed,*" **yat karma kurute, tad abhisaṁpadyate.** Rendered by Hume: "what action he performs that he procures for himself" or "into that he becomes changed"; and by Otto: "zu solchem Dasein gelangt er."

THE PULL OF THE DEED (BAU. 4.4.6*a*.).

"*germ within*" is ventured upon as a translation of **lingam.** Hume's translation is 'the inner self.' The word is derived from √**lag,** which means 'to attach or fasten oneself to' [L], and thus means etymologically 'anything attaching *to an object*' [M]. It has as its simple meaning 'mark (by which one knows or recognises a thing)'; 'kennzeichen, characteristic' [L]. Here it means 'the subtle body,' of which a description is given under the word **puruṣa** in the Vocabulary.

THE ATTAINMENT OF HIM WHO IS WITHOUT DESIRE (BAU. 4.4.6*b*, 7*a*).

"*life-breaths,*" **prāṇa.** See Voc.

"*Spirit,*" **brahman eva.** 'Spirit' is printed in italics to indicate the emphasis that **eva** attaches to **brahman.**

eva, 'just, exactly,' etc., requires the most various translations—sometimes mere stress of voice: 'precisely; no more nor less than; nothing short of; merely: quite.' [L.]

"*doth retire,*" **apy-eti.** See Note, p. 43.

"*Mortal, immortal come to be,*
Spirit now attaineth he."

Literal translation: "Then a mortal immortal becomes; therein he reaches brahman."

'Then,' **átha**, adv., expresses a sequence temporal or resultant: 'then; so then; accordingly; thereupon.' [L.]

'Therein,' **atra**, adv. (1) 'in this case; on this occasion, at this juncture.' (2) 'in this *or* that (place); here.' [L.]

"*attaineth*," **sam-aśnute**. See Note, p. 43.

The Dissolution of the Body and Again the Attainment (BAU. 4.4.7*b*).

Literal translation: "As the slough of a snake lies on an ant-hill, dead, cast off, even so lies this body. But this incorporeal, immortal, breath is brahman indeed, is glory indeed."

"*viewless breath*," **prāṇa**.

"*Spirit and glory pure*," **brahman eva, tejas eva**. See **eva** in Note on previous stanza, and **tejas** on p. 37.

Ranade thus summarises the passage: "As to the man who has no desires left in him, who is desireless because he has all his desires fulfilled, his desires being centred only in the Self, the vital airs do not depart: such a man, being Brahman (while he lived) goes to Brahman (after death).... And as the slough of a snake might lie upon an ant-hill, dead and cast away, even so does his body lie. Being verily bodiless he becomes immortal; his vital spirits are (merged in) Brahman and become pure light."[1]

The King's Largesse again (BAU. 4.4.7*c*.).

Certain verses (BAU. 4.4.8–11) that follow this stanza are almost entirely found in other Upanishads, and are consequently considered by Deussen to be an insertion. They are accordingly here omitted.

The Glory of the Self (BAU. 4.4.22*a*).

On the statement "*Nor less be made by ill*" see note on ". . . nor thief, a thief," p. 185.

The Ungraspability and Independence of the Self (BAU. 4.4.22*d*,*e*, 23*a*,*b*).

"*All designation is upon him wrecked . . .*
'No!' and 'No!' 'Tis so Alone, can those reply who that Self know," *etc.*

[1] CS., p. 156. "vital airs, vital spirits," **prāṇa**. "pure light," **tejas eva**.

We shall remember that the Self or Soul (Ātman) which the Upanishad fathers of the classical period declare to be our true self is the Transcendental, the Universal, Self. Reading the quaint sentences of this paragraph in which they express their inability to describe it, we are reminded of what Westcott calls the 'negative theology,' as contrasted with the 'positive theology' in his Essay[1] on the writings of the Neo-platonic Christian mystic, the so-called 'Dionysius the Areopagite,' who had so much influence in the Church of the Middle Ages. In that mystic's writings these two methods of describing the Infinite are set forth. According to the one, as Westcott says "everything which is may be affirmed of God, because, so far as it is, it exists in Him. According to the other, everything, so far as we are cognizant of it, may be denied of God, because our conception of it introduces the element of limitation, which cannot be applied to Him. Thus on the one hand He is Wisdom and Love and Truth and Light, because the absolute ideas belonging to these words are included in His Being; and, on the other hand, He is not Wisdom, not Love, not Truth, not Light, because He is raised infinitely above the notions with which the words are necessarily connected by men. The latter statements are in themselves more true, but the former are better suited to the common discipline of life."

"*Compelled By neither 'Hence performed I wrong' nor 'Hence I did the right' . . . Behind He leaveth both.*" (See note on ". . . nor thief, a thief," p. 185.)

"*The Self it is, etc.*"

In this line the translator adopts the reading **tasyaivātmā** in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, 3.12. (translated on p. 263 of the First Part of Deussen's *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*), inasmuch as the Taittirīya reading, when compared with that in the Upanishad, seems to be the more consonant with the teaching for which the Upanishad desires support.

[1] "Dionysius the Areopagite," in *Religious Thought in the West*, p. 159–.

13. YĀJNAVALKYA'S LAST TESTAMENT.

BAU. 2.4=4.5.

Here we have Yājnavalkya announcing his resolve to withdraw from his home to spend in the recesses of the forest a life apart of meditation on the deep problems of existence.

Belvalkar and Ranade note how in the Brāhmaṇas until a late period it was required of a man to keep faithful to household life; he was bidden to perform the household sacrifice to the end of his days. But "in the later Brāhmaṇas a life of penance in the forest is recognised and recommended, and we have sections of the Brāhmaṇas—called Āraṇyakas or 'Forest Portions'—which seem to have been specially designed for that purpose." There are seen arising in fact great numbers of wandering ascetics who keep themselves clear of all social intercourse. When we come to the Upanishads, we find a life of meditation spent in the seclusion of the forest held in high regard. We note accordingly how Yājnavalkya here takes it up and how reverently wandering ascetics are spoken of in his teaching to Janaka (No. 12, p. 129, BAU. 4.4.22–).

This sudden and widespread adoption of a solitary life as a profession, Belvalkar and Ranade can account for only by the supposition that the Āryans on their advance through India came in contact with people who led a wandering life apart from mankind in general, it might be "a people reduced to homelessness by the conquering Āryans themselves, or—and that would be just as likely—a people who had not got beyond the stage of nomad mountaineering life, such people as are not yet extinct in India," and the many eager thinkers of the Brāhmaṇa period, coming across these apart-communities, and forecasting that such a life would give them just the apartness and quiet they needed for their own discipline and meditation, adopted it, at all events for their closing years, and so came indeed to teach that such a life was the highest mode of life and indispensable for those who would deliver their souls.[1]

THE CYNOSURE (BAU. 2.4.5*a* = 4.5.6).

Ranade thus explains this paragraph: "Yājnavalkya here tells us that all things are dear for the sake of the Self.

[1] CP., p. 80.

In every act of mental affection the Ātman is calling unto the Ātman. The realisation of the Ātman is the end of all endeavour." [CS. p. 56.]

ANALOGIES (BAU. 2.4.7–10).

"*Atharvāngirasas.*" See **Atharva-Veda** in Voc.

THE ONE RENDEZVOUS (BAU. 2.4.11 = 4.12).

The teaching here is thus put by Deussen: "The Ātman, as organ of sense (that is, in the form of the particular sense-organs), is the uniting point of the corresponding relations of the outer world." (*Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda*, p. 415.)

Compare the Saying (handed down by Sextus Empiricus) of Xenophanes of Kolophōn in Ionia, near the east coast of the Aegean Sea (born about 580–77 B.C. [Ueberweg]), who later settled at Ĕlĕa in Lower Italy, of whom Aristotle says that he was "the first among the Eleatic philosophers to uphold-the-One [**henisas**] for, looking away [from the earth] into the whole heaven [**ouranos**], he said that the One was God"[1]: *As a whole* [**oulos**[2]] *he sees, as a whole he thinks* [**noei**], *as a whole he hears.*[3]

The term used in this Section for the centre is **ekāyanam**, here translated variously 'meeting-place,' 'counting-house,' 'rendezvous,' etc., literally 'one going, one path' (**eka**, 'one'; **ay-ana**, 'going').

'The mind,' **manas**. It is to be remembered that **manas** has the meaning of 'mind' in the English expression: "I have a mind to do that," in which will and feeling are predominant in the thought. (See **manas** in Voc.)

'Sciences,' 'heart.' The word here translated science is **vidyā**, 'knowledge.' It is to be remembered that the knowledge sought by the ancient Hindus was knowledge as power, that which the **manas** could take up and use, and that the prime use, in view was the gaining of salvation; as Stanislav Schayer says, "Indian philosophy is in its first line a metaphysic of deliverance."[4] It is to be noted in this connection that **manas** is regarded in the Rigveda as residing in the heart.

[1] Arist. *Metaph.*, I, 5, 967*b*, 21, quoted in Ueberweg-Heinze, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, Vol. I, p. 54.
[2] For Attic *holos*. [3] *Ueberweg-Heinze*, I, 55.
[4] *Jahrbuch der Schopenhauer=Gesellschaft*, 1928, p. 60.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SELF (BAU. 2.4.12*a*).

"*amalgam,*" **ghaná**, m. a compacted mass, lump. [√**ghan**, i.e. **han**, smite.]

"*discernment,*" **vi-jnāna**, m. knowledge (by noting distinctions). [√**jnā**, know+**vi**, apart, asunder, away.] For **jnā** and **vi-jnāna** see **vi-jnāna** in Voc.

THE CEASING OF CONSCIOUSNESS (BAU. 2.4.12*b*).

"*consciousness,*" **saṁ-jnā**, knowledge (by placing things together). [**jnā**+**sam**, 'together,' expressing union or completeness. [M.].]

"*bewilderment*"; 'because this seems contradictory to the former statement that the Self is **ghana vi-jnāna**.' [Note in Bombay Edition of *The Twelve Upanishads*.]

14. THE WORLD BEYOND.
(CU. 8.4.)

15. THE SECRET TEACHING GIVEN TO THE GODS AND DEMONS BY THE LORD OF CREATURES REGARDING THE TRUE SELF.
CU. 8.7–12.

"*The Creatures' Lord,*" **Prajāpati**. (See Voc.)

Indra. (See Voc.)

Vi-rócana. (See Voc.)

"*That is the Self of which I spake*" . . .
But as they went the Lord upon
Them looked and said, "Behold these two have gone,
The Self not grasped or understood."

Ranade points out that the *ad-hoc* or temporising method is often adopted by Upanishadic philosophers. They then show themselves "absolutely pertinent and never illuminate on any topic except that which is immediately before them and then according to the capacity of the learner." He points out here accordingly, "Their preceptor, Prajāpati, does not tell Indra and Virocana the secret of philosophy all at once, but only when either of them has prepared himself for receiving the wisdom to be imparted. It thus happens that Virocana is completely satisfied with the first answer of Prajāpati, but Indra is not, and presses his Master again and again for the solution of his difficulties,

Prajāpati disclosing the secret of his philosophy only ultimately." (CS. p. 39.)

"That shews why now we fling the name
'Devilish' on that man with sharp-cut blame who gives not,"
etc.,
"'Devilish he' our cry."

The Sanskrit terms **devá** and **ásura**, translated in our version of this story 'god' and 'demon' or 'devil,' respectively, have an interesting history.

Each of the terms originally meant 'god,' **deva**, which is, Lanman tells us, perhaps from the noun **dív**, which means 'sky,' 'heaven,' and is found in the Greek *Zeus*, (**Djēus*); and in the 'Jū' of the Latin *Jū-piter*, 'Heaven-Father,' and in *deus*, 'god.'

The meaning found for **ásura** by Böhtlingk and Roth in their great Sanskrit Dictionary, published at St. Petersburg in 1855, is, when it is used as an *adjective*, 'living,' as applied to incorporeal life. Keith and Lanman think a connection with **as-u** breath is possible, which word again is based upon the √**as**, which means 'to be, exist.' Böhtlingk and Roth tell us that it signifies the essential difference between immaterial divine existence and visible earthly existence, and is used so in the Rigveda of gods in general and, when applied to individual gods, chiefly of Varuṇa or Mitra-Varuṇa and Agni, and especially of Heaven and the 'highest spirit' ruling there, the highest conception of which is Varuṇa. At that point B. and R. note in comparison the Avestan epithet 'Ahura Mazdā.' So the adjective comes to mean incorporeal, superhuman, godly in general.

When, however, **ásura** is used as a *noun* a remarkable change sets in. At first it has the same meaning as the adjective, 'spirit,' 'heaven,' and 'the highest spirit' ruling there; but it comes to be used later of an incorporeal being, spirit or ghost, of evil sort, a demon; in some cases, of an unnamed uppermost of evil spirits, in other cases of either individual spirits or hosts of spirits who are opposed to the gods. This change takes place especially in certain passages of the tenth book, one of the late books of the Rigveda. This so different use is very frequent in the Atharva-Veda. It is the use in all the Brāhmaṇas and

throughout the whole following literature. Numerous allegories and myths, B. and R. further tell us, concerning contests between the gods (devas) and these asuras, are brought forward in the Brāhmaṇas in order to link with the determined opposition now apparent between devas and asuras certain customs and statements of belief.

A further point is that Belvalkar and Ranade see in these devas and asuras not simply spirits, but two sets of human beings. We read in the Brāhmaṇas that the devas were at first in a minority, and for a long time the asuras got the better of them; but eventually the gods, the devas, won. So our two scholars take it—and they regard the above quoted passage in this Indra-Virocana story as confirming their supposition—that the asuras were professors of a long-established religion, the devas—innovators. There was not much external difference indeed, they aver, between the two groups. Both bodies practised magic, but the asuras laid greater stress on the materials used in the sacrifice and the movements made, while the devas were insistent rather on "earnestness in sacrifice, and faith in the omnipotence of the object of worship." So it was to a certain extent a matter of my-doxy is orthodox and thy-doxy is heterodox, as our two scholars remark; and certainly (which our scholars note is not uncommon in such contests) the devas came to give (as this Indra-Virocana story, these scholars hold, bears witness) a thoroughly opprobious significance to the high-sounding name of their foes. That the devas received their own back from the unprogressives is probable, and may be said to be proved by the next points of interest we note.[1]

For Belvalkar and Ranade bring forward as 'not improbable in itself' the suggestion made by R. G. Bhandarkar that these asuras were originally Assyrians, the word **asurya**, 'demonic,' applied to them being "philologically identical with the word Assyrian," *y* and *u* being interchangeable as in Greek. Belvalkar and Ranade add, however, that it will answer all that we find in the Brāhmaṇas, if the asuras are supposed to be simply "of the same stock of people as the devas, and, if not actually resident in

[1] For these suggestions of Belvalkar and Ranade, see CS., p. 157, note, and CP., pp. 54–56.

Assyria, possessing at least 'a religion and worship largely patterned after and influenced by the religion and worship of the Assyrians.'"

A striking confirmation of this supposition of the locale of the original asuras and their strife with the devas is found in the fact that in the Avesta, the sacred book of Assyria, the word daeva has come to mean 'demon' or 'devil'; for there we have indication of what, as we have just said, might well be expected, namely, that the asuras paid the devas back in the devas' own coin.

Here is the strife we described in our Introduction (pp. 10, 11) between those, here denominated 'devas,' who received the new god Varuṇa as the true Asura, and those who maintained the old way of thinking and the Asura of the old days.

"*O Munificent,*" **maghavan.**

Macdonell tells us that this adjective, **maghavan,** 'bountiful,' is applied to Indra with great frequency in the Rigveda, and gives so clearly his distinctive character that it becomes there almost the monopoly it is for him in Post-Vedic Literature (*Vedic Mythology*, p. 63).

"*form his own.*"

Ranade points out that Prajāpati by his *ad hoc*, point-by-point, method, has led his pupil Indra stage by stage, demonstrating to him, first, that the true Self is not a mere bodily double; next that it is not identical with the Self in dream; nor, next, with the Self in deep sleep; now finally disclosing to him that the true Self is the Self that is identical-with-itself [CS., pp. 39–40]; or, in other words—to quote from Ranade and Belvalkar's joint work—"the ultimate Reality must not be mistaken for bodily consciousness, nor dream-consciousness, but is that pure Self consciousness which transcends all bodily or mental conditions" (Cp. p. 238).

"*supremely makes his way.*"

The lines from this point to the end Belvalkar and Ranade view as "too sensuous in colouring" [Cp. p. 373], and

Deussen, for that and other reasons, regards them as an addition [*Sechsis Upanishads des Veda*, p. 195].

16. THE ADVANTAGE OF KNOWLEDGE OF ONE'S NATURE.

BAU. 2.2.1,2.

"The breath that moves within the mouth" and "the breath that through one's body moves" are represented by the same word, **prāṇa**, in the original; but it is evident that **prāṇa** at its former occurrence has the first significance mentioned, and at its latter occurrence the second significance. (See note on **prāṇa** in Voc.)

THE SEVEN GODS AND THE CHILD.

I. Rudra, the God of Lightning.

Described in the Rigveda as of a dazzling shape, possessing hands and arms and limbs, a thousand-eyed, and so on, with his belly black and his back red, dwelling in the mountains; not purely maleficent like a demon, being besought not only to avert calamity, but also to bestow blessings. But his weapon, the thunderbolt, is maleficent. The deprecation of his wrath gave rise to the euphemistic epithet **śiva**, 'kind,' which became the name of the great god Śiva of post-Vedic mythology, who is, as Professor Macdonell expresses it, "Rudra's historical successor."[1]

Professor Lanman tells us that the Hindus connect the word **rudra** with √**rud**, cry (cp. Lat. *rŭd-ere*, 'roar'), and so understand it to describe Rudra as 'howling, roaring, terrible,' as indeed with the same adjective Agni (Fire) and other gods are described; but the true meaning of the word, Lanman says, is uncertain.

II. The God of Rain, Parjanya.

In the Rigveda also an appellative of the rain-cloud. In some cases it is hard to tell whether the god or the cloud is meant. Parjanya is represented not only in human form, but also in animal form, as a roaring bull (rain heavy), or as a barren cow (rain *nil*). The shedding of rain is his most prominent characteristic.[2]

[1] VM. [2] *Id.*

The derivation of the word is uncertain, Professor Macdonell tells us, but is usually identified, owing to the similarity of character of the god, with the name of the Lithuanian thunder god Perkúnas, although the phonetic difficulties of identification cannot be explained.[1] We find the same root in Gk. *perdix*, partridge; from *perdomai*, to break wind; Eng. *partridge*.

III. The Sun-god Āditya (the word here used).

The term Ādityas is used not infrequently in the Rigveda to describe the gods in general. When meaning a group of gods it is the gods of celestial light, sun, moon, stars, dawn, that are meant. Naturally, the sun, being the chief god of celestial light, is usually intended.[2]

The name is clearly a metronymic formation from that of their mother Aditi, with whom they are often invoked. (See *Aditi* in Voc.).

We find in the Rigveda three gods connected with the sun.

(*a*) *Sūrya*. This word is not only the name of the god, but also the common name for the sun itself. In fact, it is in many cases impossible to tell whether the god or the luminary is intended.

The god is presented driving in a car, but sometimes he is referred to as a bird, a bull, a white and brilliant steed, a gem, a brilliant weapon.

His eye is several times mentioned. He is far-seeing, the spy indeed of the whole world, who beholds all beings and kens both the good and the bad deeds of mortals. The affinity of the eye to the sun, an affinity touched upon in the Upanishad section here versified, is indicated in one passage, where the eye of the dead man is conceived as going to Sūrya (RV. 10.16,[3]; cp. 90.[3], 158.[3],[4])[3], a conception frequently found later, for example in BAU. 3.2.13.

With the word *Sūrya* Lanman compares the Gk. *Seir-ios*, *Seir*, 'sun, dog-star,' and the Lat. *sōl*.

(*b*) *Savitṛ*, a golden deity in human form, golden-eyed, with golden hands, tongue, arms, yellow-haired, driving in a golden car; the sun's divine power personified, **savitṛ** meaning 'stimulator.'[4] It is derived from √**su**, impel [L].

[1] VM. [2] *Id.*
[3] *Id.* [4] *Id.*

(*c*) *Vivasvant.* The name of this deity means 'shining forth'; √**vas**, 'grow bright, light up (of the breaking of the day), dawn' + **vi**, 'forth, away.' [L.]

On account of this meaning and the connection of this god with morning deities and the sacrifice, Macdonell thinks that he most probably represented originally the rising sun. Most scholars, however, he adds, take Vivasvant to be simply the sun.[1]

With √**vas** Lanman notes as cognates, Lat. *us-tu-s*, burned; Eng. *east*; *Easter*, etc.

IV. The God of Fire, Agni.

He is the terrestial deity of primary importance in the Rigveda, inasmuch as he is the personification of the sacrificial fire which is the centre of the ritual poetry thereof. Indeed, next to Indra, he is the most prominent, Macdonell tells us, of all the Vedic gods.

Agni is the name of fire as well as of the God of Fire, which means that the anthropomorphism of his physical appearance is quite rudimentary. It is to the sacrificial aspect of the terrestial fire that such bodily parts as he possesses mainly refer. Thus he is butter-backed, butter-faced, beautiful-tongued, butter-haired (in allusion to the butter dropped as an offering into the flame). He is also often likened to various animals, in most cases doubtless with a view to indicate his functions rather than his personal form. Thus he is a bull, a horse with an agitated tail (doubtless his flame), an eagle, once—a raging serpent. He is frequently compared with inanimate objects.[2]

Lanman conjectures that Agni means 'the quickly moving or agile one' from √**aj**; set in motion, drive. With **agni** he compares Lat. *ignis*, fire; *agilis*, agile, and with √**aj**, the Lat. *ago*, lead, drive, and Gk. *agō*, lead.

V. Indra. (See Voc.)

VI and VII. Heaven and Earth.

Earth was regarded as Mother, Heaven as Father, a widely spread idea among mankind (See VM., p. 8).

Dyaus, the word here for heaven, is connected with √**div**, shine [L].

[1] VM. [2] *Id.*

Prithivī, the word here for earth denotes the earth as "the wide and the broad." With the word, cp. Gk. *platus*, 'wide,' and the akin Ger. *Fladen*, 'broad, thin' cake. [L.]

17. THE EIGHT WARDENS OF THE HEAD.

BAU. 2.2.3.

"*Spirit doth for comrade take,*" **brahmaṇā saṁ-vidānā**; 'mit dem Gebete verbunden' [D.]; 'united with prayer (**brahman**)' [H.]; 'communicating with Brahman' [S. C. Vasu in B. D. Basu's *Sacred Books of the Hindus*].

18. THE HOMAGE OF ALL THINGS TO HIM WHO IN ALL THINGS SEES THE SELF.

BAU. 4.3.37.

See Note "That is the Self," on p. 179.

19. THE MEANING OF THE THUNDER.

BAU. 5.2.

"*The Creatures' Lord,*" **Prajāpati**. (See Voc.).

20. THE SUPREMACY OF THE REAL.

BAU. 5.5.1*a*.

"*The Real,*" **satyam**; "*The True*" [CP]. (See Voc.)
"*Spirit,*" **brahman**. (See Voc.)

21. THE FALSE IN TRUTH'S EMBRACE.

BAU. 5.5.1*b*.

Other etymological solutions of **satyam** are given in CU. 8.3.5. and Kaush. 1.6.

an-ṛtam. (See **an-ṛta** in Voc.)

(a) "[*The Truth*] *doth preponderance take.*"

(b) "*And, not thus* [that is, by the Real] *held,* [the False] *could never be.*"

These represent two interpretations of the Sanskrit word here used, **bhūyam**. The word is evidently derived from √**bhū**, 'become' [cf. Gk. *ephu*, 'became, grew'; Lat. *fu-it*, 'was'; Eng. '*be.*' [L.]]

(a) "*preponderance take.*" The form of the word recalls the comparative adjective **bhū-yas**, 'more, greater.' That

that gives the meaning is supposed in Basu's *Sacred Books of the Hindus*, which translates the passage thus: "This word **Sattyam** consists of three syllables: **Sat** is one syllable; **T** is another letter; and **Ya** is the third syllable. The first and last syllables form the word **Satya**. The middle one is useless. Therefore this useless syllable (**T** or false knowledge) is encompassed on both sides by this Remover of Darkness, called **Sattyam**. So there is the predominance of **Satya**. False knowledge never does him any harm who knows it thus."

It will be noticed that **Satyam** is presented here as **Sattyam**, and that the threefold division is **sat-t-yam**, not **sa-ti-yam**. The commentator tells us that it is because **t** has "no vowel or truth in it" that it is to be taken as "expressive of false knowledge."

Roer (in the *Twelve Upanishads* ed. by R. T. Tatya) also understands that the word refers to **bhūyas**, translating thus: "Falsehood is on either side encompassed by truth. There is therefore a preponderance of truth."

(b) "*could never be.*" The word may be a qualitative adjective based upon √**bhū** and therefore mean, 'having being as its quality.' Hume so understands, translating thus: "That [namely **Satyam**] is trisyllabic: **sa-ti-yam**. **Sa** is one syllable. **Ti** is one syllable. **Yam** is one syllable. In the middle is falsehood. This falsehood is embraced on both sides by truth. It partakes of the nature of truth itself. Falsehood does not injure him who knows this."

22. THE SUPREME AUSTERITIES.

BAU. 5.11.

23. THE SIN-DETERRENT FIRE.

Maitr. 6.18*c*.

24. THE NECESSITY OF THE REVELATION OF THE SELF TO THE SELF.

A. ŚU. 1.6.

"*Spirit,*" **brahman**. (See Voc.)

The stanza here versified follows immediately these two descriptions of the Self:

(*a*) *As a Wheel* (ŚU. 1.4). "We understand Him [as a

Wheel] with one nave and a triple tire,[1] with sixteen end-parts,[2] fifty spokes,[3] twenty counter-spokes,[4] with six sets of eights,[5] whose one rope[6] is manifold, which has three different paths,[7] whose one illusion has two conditioning causes."[8]

(*b*) *As a River* (ŚU. 1.5). "We understand Him as a River of five streams,[9] from five sources,[10] which make it fierce and crooked; whose waves are the five vital breaths;[11] whose original source is the fivefold alertness; with five rapids,[12] an impetuous flood of fivefold misery, divided into five distresses, with five branches."[13]

B. KU. 2.24.

C. KU. 2.23=Muṇḍ. 3.2.3.

"*Whose body* [**tanu**] *He doth choose His own to make.*"

This is E. W. Hopkins's translation in Note on p. 233 of his *Religions of India*.

Hume has "To such a one that Soul (Ātman) reveals his own person."

Deussen has in the text: "To him the Ātman reveals his Being (*Wesen*)," and in a note "Or: 'His self the Ātman chooses as His own.'" (*Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda*, p. 275). **tanu** or **tanū** f. body; person; one's own person, self; outward form or manifestation. [prop. 'stretched out,' √**tan**, stretch; cp. Lat. *tenuis*, thin; Eng. *thin*; Germ. *dünn*, thin.] [L.]

[1] The Three Qualities of the Universe: purity, passion, darkness [H].

[2] That is, the five elements of the material world, the five organs of perception, the five organs of action, and the mind (**manas**) [H].

[3] The fifty conditions of the Sānkhya philosophy [H].

[4] The ten senses and their ten corresponding objects [H].

[5] That is (i) the eight causes that produce the world; (ii) the eight constituents of the body, (iii) the eight forms of superhuman power; (iv) the eight conditions; (v) the eight gods; (vi) the eight virtues [H].

[6] Desire [H]. The Cosmic Person [CS., p. 34].

[7] Different meanings are given. See H in loc.; CP., p. 126; CS., p. 34.

[8] The consequences of good and of evil deeds [H].

[9] The five senses.

[10] The five elements.

[11] See **prāṇa** in Voc.

[12] The kinds of grief caused by generation, existence, transformation, declination, decay, which entangle a man into them. [CS., p. 35.]

[13] The five tides of periodic overflow: birth, childhood, manhood, old age, and death. [CS., p. 35.]

The above translation and interpretations are taken from H. and CS.

D. KU. 2.20=Śvet. 3.20.

"*The Effortless,*" **a-kratum**, accusative case. So in ŚU.

KU has nominative, which indicates that the individual soul is depicted as the effortless. The version of ŚU. seems preferable, for the point of the stanza evidently is that it is by the revelation to it of the Unitive Self as effortless, and as being the verity of the individual self, that the individual self attains effortlessness.

a, privative prefix. **krátu** m. 'power,' whether of mind or of body or of both. √**kṛ**, 'do, effect.' [cp. Gk. *kratus*, 'mighty'; Eng. *hard*]. [L].

"*favour kind,*" **prasāda**.

prasāda, m. grace; favour.

pra-sad, be favourable, gracious; from √**sad**, sit. +**pra** (forward, cp. Gk., Lat., *pro*, forward, fore).

We may therefore infer that behind the meaning 'be gracious' there is the meaning 'settle forward, incline towards' (e.g.) a suppliant. [L.]

E. KU. 2.21, 22.

Vocabulary of Some Important Sanskrit Words

THE SANSKRIT ALPHABET

GIVING ORDER OF THE WORDS IN THE VOCABULARY.

Vowels: a ā i ī u ū ṛ ṝ ḷ ḹ e o ai au

Hard breathing: ḥ

Nasal signs: ṁ ṃ

						nasal
Mutes:	guttural	k	kh	g	gh	ṅ
	palatal	c	ch	j	jh	ñ
	domal	ṭ	ṭh	ḍ	ḍh	ṇ
	dental	t	th	d	dh	n
	labial	p	ph	b	bh	m

Semi-vowels: y r l v

Sibilants	palatal	ś
	domal	ṣ
	dental	s

Aspiration: h

(For Pronunciation see note prefacing the Versification.)

LIST OF WORDS

	PAGE
Átharvan	206
Á-diti	
án-ṛta	207
Angirases	
Ātman	
Atharva-Veda	
ap, samudrá	208
Índra	209
Uddālaka Āruṇeya	
upa-ni-ṣad	
ṛtá	210
oṁ	
kárman	211
gandharvá	
Gautama	
Chāndogya Upaniṣad	212
Janaka, Kurupancālas, Kosala-Videhas	
Taittirīyas	
púruṣa	213
Prajā́-pati	215
prāṇá, apāná, vy-āná, ud-āná, sam-āná	216
Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad	218
bráhman, brahmán, brāhmaṇá, brā́hmaṇa	
mánas	222
Mitra	
Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad	
Yājna-valkya	
Varuṇa	223
vi-jnāna	224
Vi-rócana	
véda, Ṛg-veda, Yajur-veda, Sāma-veda, Atharva-veda	
Śata-patha Brāhmaṇa	225
Śāṇḍilya	
Śveta-ketu	
sat	226
sat-tva	
sat-yá	
Satya-kāma	227
saṁ-sāra	
Hāri-drumata	

N.B.—The words in this List and *other* words explained in the course of the book are included in the *General Index*.

Átharvan, an ancient mythical fire-priest.

The name in the singular denotes the head of a semi-divine family of mythical priests. In the plural the family as a whole is meant. The Atharva-Veda calls them gods and describes them as dwelling in heaven.

In the Rigveda Atharvan is described as bringing Agni (Fire) by rubbing it out of the fire-stick, Agni thus brought forth becoming the messenger of Vivasvat the sun-god. The Atharva-Veda recounts other marvellous deeds.

The cognate word in the Avesta, **āthravan**, signifies 'fire-priest'; and the Avestan **ātar** (for **āthar**) 'fire,' is the same as the Vedic **athar**; which also occurs in **athar-yú**, flaming (said of Agni, RV. 7.1.)[1]

Atharva-Veda. The Collection of Spells, named **Atharvāngirasas** [Hymns], the most prominent names among the 'seers' being Atharvan, Brahman, Atharvāngiras, and Angiras.[2]

Á-diti—'the Infinite.'

Aditi is a goddess in the Rigveda. Her name means Liberation, literally 'Un-binding,' being derived from √**dā**, 'bind' (cp. Gk. *deō*, *didēmi*, bind), and **a**, privative.

Macdonell supposes this goddess to have originated from certain great gods, especially Mitra and Varuṇa, being regarded as deliverers of their worshippers from the bonds of sin, and hence classed together as **ādityas**, that is those connected with **a-diti**, liberation or deliverance. So did A-diti, Liberation, come to be considered their Mother and was given the rank of a goddess and herself appealed to to deliver her worshippers from their sins.[1]

She is described as bright and luminous, a supporter of creatures, mistress of wide stalls, belonging to all men, widely expanded, sometimes as herself the wide earth or 'the boundless sky,' although sometimes distinguished from them both. As to her form, we find her addressed as a cow; and we can understand that, when we remember a favourite view of the universe was to regard it as a great ox whose head was the east, tail the west, and quarters the quarters of the heaven (see Selection 2 [BAU. 1.2], p. 58, and Selection 7 [CU. 4.4–9]). This all-inclusive conception of Aditi is set out in detail in the passage, RV. 1.89.10: "Aditi is the sky; Aditi is the air; Aditi is the mother father son; Aditi is all the gods and the five tribes; Aditi is whatever has been born; Aditi is whatever shall be born."[1]

The philosophers of the Upanishads have left these deities of their forefathers behind them, and it is not as a goddess, but simply as the Infinite, regarded as the Perpetual Casting off of Bonds or Limitations, we are to understand Aditi at the

[1] VM.

[2] See Lanman's notes on p. 1039 of his *Whitney's Atharva-Veda*.

occurrence of the word in "The Evolution of the Cosmos," p. 65. It will be observed that, in order to enforce the teaching of the passage, the word is divided not according to its proper division, **A-diti**, but **Ad-iti**, 'eating,' 'consuming,' from √**ad**, 'eat' (cp. Gk. and Lat. *ed-o*).

Án-ṛta, *neut.*, untruth, wrong (**an**, *negative*, and **ṛta**, which see). [L.]

Angirases, the sons of Ángiras, a race of semi-mythical beings mentioned in the Rigveda.

Marvellous deeds are told of them: how they found Agni (Fire) hidden in the fire-stick and thought of the first ordinance of sacrifice, and were famous for the power of their songs; how by sacrifice they obtained immortality as well as the friendship of Indra, the chief of the gods; how they indeed assisted Indra in his great exploit of slaying the sky-serpent and releasing the sky-cows (the clouds) he had imprisoned [see *Indra*] and so on.[1]

Macdonell considers it probable that the Angirases were originally conceived as a race of higher beings intermediate between gods and men, and as such were attendants on Agni (Fire), the messenger between heaven and earth; and that it was later on that they came to be regarded as priests. They were possibly, he thinks, personifications of the flames of the sacrifice from these being regarded as messengers to heaven. This view is borne out, he says, by the etymological connection of **angiras** with the Gk. *angelos*, 'messenger.'[2]

Ātmán, *m.* 'Self,' 'Soul.'

Two roots are thought by Belvalkar and Ranade to have quite probably an equal share in making up this meaning, namely, √**an**, to breathe, and **tman**, which the Rigveda frequently has in place of **ātman**, and which means 'one's self.'[3] This latter derivation Deussen adopts and, applying it precisely, asks whether it may not be the case that, as perhaps in the Greek *autos*, two pronominal stems are enclosed in **ātman**, namely, **a**, as in the Sanskrit **a-ham**, which means 'I,' and **ta**, 'this,' so that the original significance accordingly was 'this I,' 'my proper self.' And 'this I,' 'my proper self,' he finds to have four forms of meaning, each asserting the contrast of self to not-self.

I. The body, that is one's own body, in contrast to the world outside.
II. The trunk of one's body in contrast to one's limbs.
III. One's soul in contrast to one's body.
IV. One's being or essence in contrast to what is not essential.[4]

[1] VM. [2] Vedic Index and VM. [3] CP., p. 357.
[4] Deussen: *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*, I, 1, pp. 285, 6.

Belvalkar and Ranade point out that it is the recognition of the Atman or Self as 'the highest cosmological principle' that is the culminating point of Upanishad philosophy, and they rightly maintain the 'venturesomeness' of the conception, involving as it does that 'the energy we feel throbbing within us is not only identical with the energy that keeps the world without us moving, but creates and sustains it.' The origin of the idea they attribute to the constant pairing we find in the Brāhmaṇas of the microcosm and the macrocosm, the power and functions of the one being found in the other. This meant indeed at first a dualism, the microcosm being within, and its co-ordinate macrocosm without. But the dualism was in time overcome by making the Ātman, the One Self, the root-cause of all that is.[1]

ap, *f.* 'water; waters:' *plural* only. **sam-udrá**, 'gathering of waters:' see p. 159.

(*a*) natural significance. Water or waters, be it cloud or river. It is a moot question whether the Upanishad Fathers knew the sea. Their ancient forefathers had entered India at the North-West far from the ocean and the eastward extending people among whom these Fathers lived were still at the middle of the plain of the Ganges on its course from mid-Himālaya to the sea.[2]

(*b*) cosmological significance: the primeval waters, the original form of the world.[3] [Compare 'the deep' of Gen. i.]

(*c*) earlier-scientific significance. The waters are regarded as the essence of vegetation. They are believed to possess a generative power, a power also to heal and to lengthen life.[4]

(*d*) mythical significance. The waters are regarded as the elixir of immortality. Both the waters and the juice soma are believed to dwell in the highest heaven, where Yama, the first man, presides at the festival of the fathers. Thence are the waters, as life-sap, brought to earth by the Gandharvas and Apsarases (sky-elves and water nymphs) and introduced by them into men animals and plants.[5]

(*e*) later-scientific view. All liquid existence is included under the term āpas. That is the meaning of the term in the teaching Uddālaka gives to his son (Selection 10, CU. 6).

[1] CP. p. 358–9.

[2] See article "Sam-udra" in *Vedic Index*, for discussion on this.

[3] See paper on "Yama, Gandharva, and Glaucus," by L. D. Barnett (who gives references) in *Bulletin* of School of Oriental Studies, London Institution, Vol. IV, Part iv, p. 706.

[4] *Id.* [5] VM.

Índra, the Storm-god, of tawny colour and gigantic size, with the thunderbolt as his weapon. His great exploit, which the Rigveda poets are never weary of celebrating, was his slaying of the demon-serpent of drought, who rested on the waters of the sky, named Vṛtra (the Obstructor). Vṛtra had imprisoned in the aerial mountain on which he rested the cows, the clouds, which pour down their rains, as cows do their milk. Indra released the cloud-cows, and thus brought to an end the drought—a mythological presentation of the effect of the yearly monsoon.

As the Āryans proceeded eastward through the Panjāb, having occasionally heavy encounters with the peoples they had dispossessed, Indra became the national war-god who enabled them to have victory.

Thus he came to be an eager and strong fighter, fulfilling mighty exploits; not only a fighter but drinking the Soma to help him to accomplish his triumphs; a braggart withal and, when under the excitement of Soma, boasting impossible feats.

As harmonises well with such a character, he was greatly generous, the term **maghávan** (munificent) being applied in the Rigveda almost exclusively to him in comparison with the other gods. We will notice that he is so addressed in the Indra-Virocana story (Selection 15, CU. 8-7-12).

Eventually he became the chief of the gods, as we find him in that story.

The origin of his name is doubtful, but Macdonell thinks it likely that it is connected with **indu**, 'drop.'

See also Introduction, p. 14.

Uddālaka Āruṇeya (descendant of Aruṇa) was of the Gautama family (see **Gautama**) of the Brahmins, and one of the Kuru-Pancāla people, who dwelt in the upper plain of the Jumna and Ganges. These Brahmins for centuries had taught the knowledge handed down to us in the Brāhmaṇas, discourses which describe the marvellous powers of the sacrifice; but Uddālaka tells us in Selection 10 (CU. 6) that a new school of thought had arisen in his day which he himself accepted, that left this trust in the power of ritual behind and propounded the deeper knowledge communicated in the Upanishads. We find in that Selection Uddālaka teaching the new knowledge to his son Śvetaketu.

Yājnavalkya of Selections 12 (BAU. 4.3–4.7, 22–25) and 13 (BAU. 2.4=4.5) was also a pupil of Uddālaka's.

upa-ni-ṣad, 'a secret communication.'

In the Brāhmaṇas the word, Macdonell and Keith tell us, normally denotes the 'secret sense' of some word or text, sometimes the 'secret rule' of a mendicant.[1] In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad it is, however, already used in the plural,

[1] *Vedic Index.*

and has come to mean discourses spoken in secret. The natural derivation of the word is from √**sad** (cp. Lat. *sedeo*), sit+**ni**, down+**upa**, near, that is, 'sit down, settle oneself, near (a teacher),' and this derivation gives it its first meaning, as Prof. Keith puts it, of 'a session of pupils in process of instruction round a teacher.'[1] Hence comes readily the meaning 'secret doctrine,' and, from that, 'a compendium of secret doctrine.'[2]

ṛtá, *adj.* 'fit,' 'true,' as *neuter noun*, 'established order.' [*prop.* 'fitted, made firm', √ṛ; for form and meaning, cp. Lat. *rĕ-tu-s*, 'settled.'] [L.]

Professor Maurice Bloomfield praises the idea of **ṛta**. It is a high thought, he says, that is in many ways similar to the Confucian idea of 'order, harmony, and absence of disturbance.' In the Veda it presents itself under the threefold aspect of (*a*) cosmic order, (*b*) correct and fitting cult of the gods, and (*c*) moral conduct of man. So we have in connection with it 'a pretty complete system of ethics, a kind of counsel of perfection.'

(*a*) As the basis of cosmic order, **ṛta** rules the world and nature. The maidens dawn, daughters of heaven, shine on successive mornings "in harmony with **ṛta**. It is from the seat of **ṛta** they awake. The sun is placed in the sky in obedience to the **ṛta**. The gods themselves are born of the **ṛta** or in the **ṛta** they show by their acts that they know the **ṛta**, observe the **ṛta**, and love the **ṛta**."

(*b*) Bloomfield takes a lower estimate than Belvalkar and Ranade[3] do of the religion of the earlier period of the Rigveda, yet he points out that the performances of the ritual are not always regarded as merely merchandise—the accusation that rules his estimate—wherewith to traffic for the blessings of the gods. The sacrifice fire is described as kindled under the 'yoking of **ṛta**,' or, as he would put it, 'under the auspices of world order.' Again, the god of fire, is 'scion of the **ṛta**' or 'first-born of the **ṛta**.' Prayers take effect in accordance with **ṛta**.

(*c*) "In man's activity the **ṛta** manifests itself as the moral law. Here it takes by the hand the closely kindred idea of truth, **satya**. Untruth, on the other hand, is **an-ṛta**, more rarely **a-satya**, the same two words with **a** or **an**, the prefix of negation. The two words **satya** and **anṛta** form a close dual compound, 'truth and lie,' 'sincerity and falsehood.' They remain the standard words for these twin opposites for all Hindu time. Truth and lie include by an easy transition right and wrong."[4]

oṁ. This word represents the strong nasal breathing made with expanded nostrils before and after the recitation of the Veda,

[1] *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, Vol. I, p. 19.
[2] Opinion of *Vedic Index*. [3] CP., p. 3, with Note.
[4] Maurice Bloomfield, *Religion of the Veda*, p. 126.

a preparation of the voice for the utterance, and a conclusion thereto, accompanied by devotion to what is to be, and to what has been, recited.

No doubt at first it was simply the preliminary tuning of the voice while one concentrated one's mind on what was about to be uttered. Then it came to be repeated at the close.

As thus introducing. and concluding the sacred words, it came to be regarded as itself sacred, and the mysteries and magnitudes of what it thus introduced and concluded came to be regarded as comprised in itself. In fact there came to be no limit to what **oṁ** potentially held.

The vowel **o** being regarded by Hindu grammarians as composed of **a** and **u**, the full pronunciation of **oṁ** was held to be **AUM**, that is three elements, **A**, **U**, and **M**, with, in addition, nasal utterance, and much mystical and philosophical significance came to be attributed to each of these four items.

It would be of interest to investigate whether we have here what became the Jewish and subsequently the Christian Amen.

karman, deed [from √**kṛ**, perform, act, do].

The name given to the doctrine of post-mortem rewards and punishments for the good or bad action of the soul in its previous embodiments.[1]

gandharva, 'sky-elf.' In the Rigveda the **gandharva** is a bright being dwelling in the sky with his spouse apsaras, the water nymph. This union of the elf and nymph in the sky is regarded as typical of marriage. The gandharva is therefore connected with the marriage ceremony. Each of these single beings becomes a class of beings. In the Panca-viṁśa Brāhmaṇa the gandharvas and apsarases are regarded as presiding over fertility and are prayed for by those who desire offspring. In the Rigveda the gandharva is wind-haired, has brilliant weapons, and wears a fragrant garment. In the Epics they come to be celestial singers.[2]

Gautamá, 'descendant of Gótama,'[3] a common patronymic. Uddālaka Āruṇi (Selection 10 [CU. 6]) and Hāridrumata (Selection 7 [CU. 4.4.–9]) were Gautamas.

Gotama is several times mentioned in the Rigveda, but never in such a way as to denote authorship of any of the hymns. It seems clear to Macdonell and Keith that he was closely connected with the Angirases, for the Gotamas frequently refer to Angiras. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa he appears as a Puro-hita or domestic priest of Māthava Videgha (perhaps 'King of the Videhas'), and as a bearer of Vedic civilisation. In the same Brāhmaṇa he is presented as contemporary of Janaka, king of the Videhas, and of Yājnavalkya, and as author of a stóma ('song of praise').[4]

[1] CP., pp. 26–, 75–, 106.
[2] VM., pp. 136–.
[3] *Go-tama* means 'the biggest ox.' [M.]
[4] *Vedic Index*.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 'The Secret Teaching in the Chant,' **chanda,** from meaning 'pleasure; will' [its root being probably identical with √**ścand,** shine, glance (for ***skandh,** cp. Gk. *xanthos,* gold-yellow; Lat. *cand-ēre,* glow)[1]] came to signify a 'sacred hymn' and also 'metre.' In the Upaniṣad, a special chant used at the sacrifice, the Ud-gītha ('Loud Chant') is brought forward for reverence and its varied significance declared; but it is, as Belvalkar and Ranade point out, simply representative, the 'schematic presentation' of the Sāman ('chant') as such.[2]

Janaka, king of the Videhas, was noted for his interest in the problems of Being and his liberality to philosophers. We find him holding great disputations of divines at his court regarding the ultimate basis of things. It was in his day that the new teaching rose among the divines of the Kuru-Pancālas[3] whose territory was the upper plain of the Jumna and Ganges country, adjacent on the east to the territory of the Kosala-Videhas. The capital of the Kosalas was Ayodhyā, that of the Videhas was Mithilā.[4] The boundary between the Videhas and the Kosalas was the Sadānīra river, probably the modern Gandak, which, rising in Nepal, enters the Ganges opposite Patna. Janaka's territory thus corresponded roughly to the modern Tirhut.[5]

We find the men of the new learning eager to bear their knowledge to others, and Janaka was desirous to become acquainted with it. We read of a great gathering of the Kuru-Pancāla Brahmins at his court, at which the King desired to know which of them was most learned in scripture, and of Yājnavalkya, the great apostle of the new learning, carrying off the prize, against nine disputants, of a thousand cows, to the horns of each of which ten **pādas** (of gold) had been attached.

In Selection 12 (BAU. 3–4.7; 4.22–25) we have a famous private interview the king held with the champion philosopher who, chary although he was in communicating his secret doctrine, at last makes it known to the King.

Taittirīyas, *Partridge Disciples.*

These were a school that accepted the Black Yajur-veda, and the origin of their title is accounted for as follows.

There are three Vedas. The Rig-veda (the Veda of Verses), which was recited and is the original; the Yajur-veda (the Veda for Sacrifice), which consists for the greater part of Rigveda verses set in sentences to be used as formulae for muttering

[1] L. [2] CP., p. 214.

[3] The name Pancālas indicate they formed an aggregate of five (*pánca,* five). A. A. Macdonell, *Imperial Gazetteer of India,* Vol. II, p. 22.

[4] See 'Janaka' and 'Videha' in *Vedic Index.*

[5] *Id.,* Vol. II, p. 230.

at the sacrifice; and the Sāma-veda (the Veda for Tunes), which is made up of Rig-veda formulae adapted for chanting at the sacrifice.

The Yajurveda originally had the directions as to use of the formulae, explanations, legends regarding the gods, and so on, mixed up with the formulae, or 'mantras,' as they were called. But a new school arose which separated the formulae from this explanatory matter. These reformers, chief of whom was Yājnavalkya, named the Veda of the old school 'the black Yajurveda,' because it contained these mingled or uncleared texts and their own Veda, 'the white Yajurveda,' because their texts were separated from the explanations.[1]

One can well guess, then, that the Taittirīyas to whom this Upanishad belonged were a school of priests who received their name 'Taittirīyas,' that is, Partridges, 'dark-coloured birds,' because they, in contrast to the Reformers, used at the sacrifice the mingled or 'black,' uncleared, texts of the Yajur-veda.

A legend,[2] which vindicates that as the true explanation of the name, and also shows that the two schools had little love for each other, is handed down, which relates that Vaiśampāyana, the first in the line of the teachers of the Black Yajur-veda School, was offended with Yājnavalkya, who, although he was one of his twenty-seven pupils, promoted the clearance we have mentioned of the text; and bade him disgorge the original uncleared Veda he had committed to him, which Yājnavalkya promptly did, disgorging it in the form of tangible fragments. The master then commanded his other disciples, who were loyal to him, to pick up these dark, uncleared texts. Whereupon they took the form of partridges, and swallowed them. It is easy to see which of the two schools told the story.

púruṣa, person.

The continual heightening of meaning of this word is of interest.

There seems little doubt that it is derived from √**pṛ**, fill, and that accordingly the famous passage in the Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka Upanishad, where the Creator, becoming severally what we name breath, eye, voice, ear, mind, fills the human form to the tips of the nails,[3] illustrates its meaning. It is the filled-out being we behold when we look upon a man.

Belvalkar and Ranade from certain statements made in the Brāhmaṇas find clear evidence that the original meaning is 'the human being with his peculiar bodily structure,'[4] which

[1] See Lanman, *Sanskrit Reader*, pp. 355–6.
[2] Recorded in Monier Williams's *Sanskrit Dictionary*.
[3] BAU., 1.4.7. [4] CP., p. 428.

well accords with the above suggested derivation; that is to say, man simply as we look upon him. This our two scholars find to be its almost exclusive use in the earlier Upanishads. This reference to what is merely external is illustrated by the use Lanman records of it[1] to indicate a servant, as we in English use the word 'man.'

But the thought in the above-mentioned myth told upon this first meaning. It came to be understood that this filled-out form was filled-out by breath, and so was a form of the breath. Thus did the viewless breath come to be identified with the puruṣa.

We find in the Taittirīya Upanishad the position taken of several such persons as making up the man: first, outermost, the person made of food, the person whose body is the flesh; next, the person made of breath; then, the person made of the gain-seeking mind; next, the person composed of self-less intelligence, and finally the person made of bliss (Selection No. 3).

In very early times the conception was held of the world as a gigantic man, whose eye was the sun, body the air, breath the wind, and so on. In the famous Puruṣa-hymn of the Rigveda[2] this **puruṣa**, as he is there called, which 'is this all,' as the hymn puts it, is brought before us and we are told that from his eye was produced the sun, from his mouth the wind, from his navel the air, from his feet the earth, and so on. There we have the air filling out the world-person, while the wind, the moving air, is conceived as his breath.

Then we find a new phase setting in. The person of each individual was believed to exist beyond death, indeed to pass on and be the person in one body after another. So it came to be felt that this form of viewless breath needed an encasement of some sort to contain itself in its transmigration. It was therefore held to possess a body of its own, quite distinct from the body we look upon, a subtle body, known as the **lingam**,[3] no bigger than a thumb, understood to reside in the heart.[4]

[1] In Voc. to *Sanskrit Reader*.

[2] RV., 10.90.

[3] For lingam see note on BAU., 4.4.6(*a*), No. 12, p. 189.

[4] L. D. Barnett in an essay entitled "The Genius: A Study in Indo-European Psychology," in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Oct., 1929, p. 731–, describing the **fravashis** of the later Avesta, the sacred book of ancient Iran, tells us these are presented attached to each good being, as a guardian genius or divine counterpart to protect him, her, or it, against the demons and to fight on the side of Ahura Mazdāh (the Wise Lord) and the Good against the spirits of Evil. These champions for the Good dwelt collectively, for the most part at least, in heaven, but they were also individually attached to the being they guarded. Indeed, Dr. Barnett tells us, there is a story that the **amesha spentas** (immortal holy ones), the archangels created by Ahura Mazdāh, framing by order of Ahura the elemental body of Zarathustra, placed Zarathustra's **fravashi** inside (i.e. inside the elemental body, according to the wording of Dīnk, VII.

As a natural extension of this new thought it came to be imagined that, instead of the sun and other cosmic elements being simply members of a world-person, each element was inhabited by its own person, and that it was so also with man, each human element, be it eye, speech, ear, and so on, having within it its own **puruṣa**.

It was early felt that the macrocosm and the microcosm corresponded to each other, and the idea came to be reached that the human elements were the cosmic elements on the human plane. So the person in the eye looking out from its dark chamber was regarded as indeed the person looking out from the sun (Selection 16, p. 147).

Meantime the Self was coming to be acknowledged in its true supremacy. A passage in the central teaching of the Upanishads, denominating the Self as 'the Person taught in the Upanishads,' describes that Person as 'plucking apart and putting together these [lower] persons and passing beyond them.'[1]

We shall remember how the Self in that central teaching is declared to be none other than the Spirit, the Brahman, which makes the world to be what it is. So we have the next and final step easily made. The persons in the various cosmic and human elements—be it 'the immortal person made of light who dwells within the wind' and the similar 'immortal person made of light who dwells within the breath'; or 'the immortal person made of light who dwells within the sun,' and the similar 'immortal person made of light who dwells within the eye'; or other cosmic and human correspondent **puruṣas**—are all held to be, each in its special manifestation, 'none other than this immortal Self (Ātman) or Spirit (Brahman) which is all this.'[2]

So does **puruṣa** become at last the One Supreme Personal Absolute.

Prajā-pati, 'the Lord of Creatures.'

Prajā, *f.* (1) procreation; (2) offspring, children, descendants; (3) creatures; *esp.* (4) folk, subjects of a prince.
[√**jan** or **jā**, be born, produced, come into being. Cp. Gk. *ge-gon-ōs*, born, *e-gen-eto*, became; Lat. *genui*, begat; Eng. *kin*.
+**pra**, forward, onward, forth. Cp. Gk. and Lat. *pro*, before; Eng. *fore*.]

páti, *m.* (1) master, possessor; lord; ruler; (2) then (like Eng. 'lord') 'husband'. Cp. Gk. *posis*, husband; Lat. *im-pos*, stem, *im-pot*, not master of. [L.]

1.14ff., of the Bombay edition, and VII. ii.14 of S.B.E.). Thus we have in ancient Iran its own peculiar expression, in general and in particular, of the **puruṣa** we find in Āryan India. No doubt **fravashi** is a later form of the word **puruṣa**.

[1] BAU 3.9.26. [2] BAU. 2.5.1.ff. [CP. p. 429].

Belvalkar and Ranade trace the progress of this god.

In the Veda the name is first an abstract epithet, meaning 'protector of the peoples, lord of progeny,' and is applied to Savitṛ, the sun-god, Indra, the storm-god, and so on.

Later in the Veda, the term is applied to a more or less distinct individuality and brought into connection with the procreative function in nature. So when world-genesis came to be conceived as a creative process Prajāpati naturally became World-creator as well as World-protector. Hence arose a number of anthropomorphic myths. This we may call his cosmic stage.

Next, in the Brāhmaṇas comes his ritualistic stage, where he becomes, to quote Oldenberg's words, approved by our two scholars, 'an apex to the Pantheon set up by the priesthood, a god moving to and fro with each breeze of fantasy,'[1] being used, they tell us, to 'sanction and explain numberless large and small ritualistic practices.'

In the Upanishads his pre-eminence rapidly disappears. The mention of him there is of a god who as the Creator of the creatures and their Lord was revered in days gone by, a 'somewhat shadowy and uninteresting member,' as Belvalkar and Ranade put it, 'of the Vedic Pantheon.'[2]

prāṇa, 'breath.'

From √**an**, 'breathe' [cp. Gk. *anemos*, 'wind,' and Lat. *anima*, 'soul'] and **pra** [cp. Gk. and Lat. *prŏ* and Eng. *forth*, *fore*].

I. *Breath.*

The usual number of the breaths is five and we find these distinctions made:

prāṇa (√**an**+**pra**, 'forth'): 'breath' generally; with 'forth-breath,' 'out-breath,' as its proper meaning.

apāna (√**an**+**apa**, 'away'): 'out-breath.' When **prāṇa** and **apāna** are contrasted, however, **prāṇa** means 'out-breath' and **apāna** 'in-breath.' Deussen conjectures that **apa** and √**an** may here mean 'cease to breathe,' or, to put it literally, 'breath-away,' that is, 'breath absent,' the opposite of 'breathing-out,' and so, 'in-breath.' Another significance of the word is the 'away-breath,' the breath that passes downward and 'away' through the anus.

vy-āna (√**an**+**vi**, 'asunder'): the branching breath; 'traversing the whole body and maintaining its general functional equilibrium' (L. D. Barnett).

ud-āna (√**an**+**ud**, 'up'): 'up-breath,' 'mounting through the neck to cause voice' (L. D. B.), 'the breath which conducts the soul from the body at death' (Deussen).

[1] Oldenberg, *Die Weltanschauung der Br. Texte*, p. 32.

[2] CP. pp. 342–6.

sam-āna (√an+sam, 'together'), 'conspiration': 'travelling round the bowels and stomach, causing the fire that digests food' (L. D. B.). According to a late Upanishad (Amṛtab. 34.37) it dwells white as milk in the navel (Deussen).[1, 2]

II. *Senses or Functions*, 'vital breaths.'

But the **prāṇa** also may mean 'breath' as 'life,' and so the **prāṇas** the senses and functions as 'life breaths' or 'vital airs.' These, Macdonell and Keith tell us,[3] are differently numbered —six, seven, ten, eleven, twelve, as the case may be. There were said to be seven in the head: the eyes, the ears, the nostrils, and the mouth. Exactly what organs were comprised when more than seven were mentioned is not certain. We find the two breasts counted in, the navel, perhaps the suture in the crown of the skull, taste, speech, and the organs of evacuation.

III. *The changing significance of* **prāṇa** *in the Upanishads.*

Belvalkar and Ranade trace for us the changing significance of **prāṇa** in the Upanishads.

In the earliest Upanishads it means simply the breath, but it is classed as the one pre-eminent indispensable faculty, in fact, is stated to be 'all that is, no matter what,' and is declared to be inscrutable and exhaustless.

But soon, even in the earliest Upanishads, a still inner entity superior to it is spoken of. In the Bṛhad-Āranyaka Upanishad (1.4.7) the Creator comes into view entering the body he had created even to the tips of the nails, the while he takes to himself the name and function of the breath, and of other faculties. After the earliest Upanishads, we find this entrant being, who has thus taken to himself the function of breathing, declared to be the Self or Soul (Ātman) and to be essentially composed of intelligence. Thus the breath has become no longer an independent faculty, but dependent on the Self. In fact, in the account in the Taittirīya Upanishad (2.2; No. 3 in our Selections) it, the person made of breath, is only one of the forms of the Self; and the Kena Upanishad, going still further, declares that not one of the vital airs or faculties can exercise its energy save at the instigation of the central power, the Self—that the Self is 'the ear of the ear, the mind of the mind, the speech of the speech, the breath of the breath'; while the Praśna Upanishad maintains that the Self does not simply assume, as we found in the above-mentioned passage of the Bṛhad-Āranyaka Upanishad, the name and function of the breath, nor, as we have just found in the Kena, simply energise it, but is itself the producer of the breath and its subdivisions as well as the controller thereof.

[1] *Vedic Index.*

[2] See Deussen, *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, pp. 264, 276–280, and L. D. Barnett, on p. 187, in notes to his translation of the *Bhagavadgītā*.

[3] *Vedic Index.*

Nevertheless new dignities set in for the breath. We find it in the later Upanishads described as enduring beyond the span of a single life, accompanying the Self as the Self goes on from one body to another; and eventually dropping indeed all the physiological functions that originally belonged to it, and becoming, in the Praśna and Kaushītaki Upanishads, almost a synonym for the Highest Entity, the Brahman.[1]

Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad. 'The Great Collection of the Secret Teaching in the Forest.'

bṛhad, *adj.* 'great.' √**bṛh,** 'be thick, great, strong.' [L.]

āraṇyaka, *adj.* 'of the wilderness or forest' [literally 'of the strange land,' from **araṇa,** *adj.* 'distant, strange']. [L.]

bráhman, *neuter,* 'Spirit.' This seems to give best the proper meaning of the term.

In the majority of its occurrences in the Rigveda the word means 'hymn' or 'prayer,' with the thought first of the emotion that hymn and prayer imply.

The great St. Petersburg Dictionary of Böhtlingk and Roth explains it as meaning: "(1) devotion (conceived as a swelling and filling of the soul with a striving toward the gods, in general any pious expression at divine service; (2) holy speech, especially the magic formula; (3) the word of God; (4) holy wisdom, theology, theosophy; (5) holy life, especially as being a life of chastity; (6) the Brahman, the highest object of theosophy, God regarded as impersonal, the Absolute." Geldner defines it as "the ecstatic emotion (often induced by the ceremonious partaking of the juice of the Soma plant) with which one is possessed when about to perform a deed of valour or an act of piety"; and Deussen, as "prayer conceived as the will of man striving upwards towards the holy or the divine."[2]

In this case the derivation assumed is √**bṛh,** 'be thick, great, strong.' [L.] Cp. Gk. *bruō,* 'to be full to bursting' (used especially for plants, for example, of a young shoot teeming with white bloom, but also used metaphorically of men, as swelling (*e.g.*) with courage, prophetic faculty, and so on); meaning also 'to be full of (anything),' and (absolutely) 'to abound,' 'grow luxuriantly.' The Greeks named the tree-moss, liverwort, the clustering male blossom of the hazel, and catkins generally, *bruon*; the black vine and also the white vine they called *bruōnia,* hence our name 'bryony' for the latter [Liddell and Scott[1]]. Oldenburg says that the word appears to be related to the Irish *bricht,* magic, magical utterance.[3]

Now, we are to remember that, as Professor Stanislav Schayer points out, "to man in his primitive condition of culture the division between the spiritual and the material is unknown. He conceives things as possessed with soul and,

[1] CP. IX.18, where references are given.
[2] Geldner's and Deussen's definitions are reported in CP. p. 346–.
[3] *Die Lehre der Upanishaden,* p. 46.

on the other hand, psychical conditions as composed of matter. Anger, joy, hate and love in the technique of magic are dealt with as substances."[1] This primitive lack of discrimination has proved itself very persistent. A writer,[2] quoted by Professor S. Angus, says that "it is indisputable that the Greek never completely stepped out of this pre-logical mentality. Even in their philosophy it is only when we come to the Stoics that we find the distinction made, so obvious to us, between the subjective and the objective." As to spirit, which is our immediate concern here, even the Stoics regarded it as 'a quasi-material penetrating substance,' Professor Angus tells us. Such a conception, he says, was the common view of the Graeco-Roman world. It was Plotinus, he tells us, who first established the immateriality of Spirit.[3] It would seem indeed that it is to Descartes and the course of philosophy he initiated we owe the clear-cut conception we have to-day of the distinction between spirit and matter.

So we are not to suppose that the Rigvedic poets in their early day, some thirteen centuries before Christ, can have had anything but a quasi-material conception in their mind of the power that stirred within them when they intoned their hymns, calling it Brahman, 'that which makes to swell,' because it acted so in their hearts. We must not be surprised if we find them thinking of it as a sort of fluid or as a current of fire. Yet for them in their day it seems to have been just what we now understand when with our more analytical mind we speak of 'the Spirit.' Of nobility of mind in the early Vedic period we learn from Belvalkar and Ranade. These investigators find in these reciters a pure and free spirit of spontaneous rejoicing in and reverence beneath lofty gods. But with this quasi-material view of the spirit there was danger that spirit might be regarded as a substance itself possessed of power, not as simply a carrier to the gods of prayer and praise, but independent of the gods, and, since it was in the heart of him who recited, subject to the reciter's will and management. This view we find creeping in in the later Vedic period. It showed itself in the elaboration of the prayers and the sacrifices, for prayers and sacrifices were coincident, the prayers being said when the offerings were libated.

This elaboration showed itself not only in the ritual acquiring minutiæ, subdivisions, and lengthy sessions, but also by taking from the old recited hymns, the greater part of which had been composed in adoration of the gods, formulæ, which were at first simply muttered at the sacrifice, and afterwards set in metre for chanting. The original collection of hymns was called the Rig-Veda, the Veda (that is, 'the knowledge')

[1] *Jahrbuch der Schopenhauer-Gesellschaft*, 1928, p. 63–.
[2] Macchiovo, *Zagreus*, p. 165, cp. id. *Orfismo e Paolinismo*.
[3] S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World*, p. 140.

expressed in Verses (*Rig*): the collection of Formulæ, the Yajur-Veda ('The Knowledge for the Sacrifices (**Yajur**)'); the collection of these Formulæ set for chanting, the Sāma-Veda ('The Knowledge set for Chanting (**Sāma**)'). These three came to be known as 'the Threefold Knowledge,' and had each their own class of priest.

It will be noticed that the greater part of the Yajur-Veda and we may say all the Sāma-Veda are but forms of the Rig-Veda.

So, round the conception of Bráhman (Spirit moving in prayer) the eager thought of these divines revolved. Their view of it changed as time went on. Belvalkar and Ranade thus describe the course of their thought.

First, Bráhman from meaning simply an isolated prayer, came to mean the whole three Vedas we have mentioned (Rig, Yajur, Sāman). Then these were regarded as infinite. The story is told of one of the Rigvedic seers who had devoted himself for three life-lengths to Vedic studies, and had to lie down aged and infirm, who was informed by one of the gods that all he had as yet learnt was but three handfuls of three heaps big as mountains.

Again, the isolated prayer was magnified in importance, declared to be in itself, without any of the other prayers, the very and true Brahman.

Then Bráhman was separated out as different from the Vedas it inspired. "The hymns are finite, the chants finite, the formulae finite, but of what constitutes brahman there is no end."[1]

Next Bráhman, the true Bráhman, was considered to be beyond the three Vedas altogether. They might be indeed called Bráhman, but only called so, they were the Lower Bráhman, the Bráhman expressed in name or sound.[2]

Then Bráhman came to be believed to possess a concrete individuality, as we speak of 'the Spirit.'

When the sacrifice came to be believed to be a cosmic force, as we see in the Horse-Sacrifice described in Selections 1 and 2, Bráhman, regarded now as the whole sacrifice in miniature, was believed to be a significant influence in the production of the Universe, or indeed to be itself all these varied exhibitions of power that make up the world. Thus Bráhman is identified with the wind into which the five divinities, lightning, rain, moon, sun, and fire die and out of which later they come to life; with fire; particularly, with the sun. Yet the relation of Bráhman to holy prayer and formula is never forgotten.

Then we find Bráhman declared to be a personal god, to be Prajāpati, the Lord of Creatures, himself, and doing his work of creating, or still further as the self-existing principle of the world, and so lording it over Prajāpati.

[1] *Taitt. Sam.* VII, iii. 1.4. [2] References in CP. p. 353.

This theistic view of Bráhman becomes pantheistic in passages that describe Bráhman making an offering of itself into beings, and an offering of beings into itself, or in texts which speak of Bráhman being the tree (material cause) out of which the world was fashioned.

The final stage of this exaltation of Bráhman was its identification with the Self or Soul within.[1]

It was this final meaning reached in the Brāhmaṇas that was the gospel of the Upanishads, and it is found, our two scholars tell us, in the earliest texts, yet the majority of the texts in the first two groups of their allotment of Upanishad passages to successive periods uphold the earlier meanings of Brahman. It is in what they make their third group (the passages where Uddālaka and Yājnavalkya exhibit their teaching) that we find this final meaning firmly fixed, the group which accordingly our two scholars denominate the Upanishadic Group properly so called. In this group, as we run through it, we find first a number of incomplete views about the Brahman (for example, its identification with some solitary fact or phenomenon of the outer or inner world) stated and rejected, and Brahman declared to be the one in-dwelling Self, the one thread by which this world and the other world and all things are tied together, and of each thing the inner controller, the goal of all man's aspirations.[2] Next, we have a clear cut distinction formulated between the lower and higher aspects of Brahman which are already distinguished in the Brāhmaṇas. Then comes a higher aspect still. Brahman is declared to be entirely beyond qualities, infinite and immutable, expressible indeed only in negative terms—'Neti, Neti' ('No! No!'). In the third place we have a consistent description of the identification already mentioned of the Brahman without with the Ātman within, together with a correlation in full detail of the physical entities of the Brahman without, the macrocosm, and the psychical faculties of the Ātman within, the microcosm. Fourthly, we have several texts where the method is set forth in detail of knowing the Bráhman-Ātman through the 'states of the Soul,' and through mystic contemplation. Then, finally, we have an exaltation in which thought rises to the Absolute. The category of Bráhman, the impersonal spirit, is either dropped out altogether or relegated to a subordinate position as the personal Brahmā or Prajāpati, the Lord of Creatures, and upon the Absolute (considered either as the Ātman (the Self) or the Akshara (the imperishable), a sort of theistic aspect is imposed. This subordination of the Bráhman to the Absolute we find carried on into the next and last group of Belvalkar and Ranade's classification, the group which for this and other reasons they name Neo-Upanishadic.[3]

[1] CP. pp. 351–4. [2] BAU. 3.8. [3] CP. p. 355–7.

brahmán, *masc.* (1) one who has to do with Spirit (bráhman, *n.*) and therefore with prayer, divine praise and divine science, a Brahmin, a priest, theologian, divine. (2) The universe-pervading Spirit personified, the god Brahmā (brahmā being the form of the nominative singular). [L.]

brāhmaṇá, *masc.* (1) one who has to do with Spirit and so with same significance as brahmán (1).

brā́hmaṇa, *neut.* a saying concerned with Spirit, the dictum of a priest on matters of faith and cultus; esp. a Brā́hmaṇa as designating a Collection of these dicta. [L.]

mánas, *n.* mind, in its widest sense as applied to the powers of conception, will and emotion: thus (1) 'the intellect,' 'the thoughts,' 'understanding,' 'mind'; (2) 'reflection,' 'excogitation,' perhaps 'the thing excogitated,' 'praise,' or 'devotion'; (3) 'wish,' 'inclination towards'; (4) 'desire'; (5) 'feeling,' 'disposition,' 'heart.' [L.] √**man**, 'be minded': (1) 'think'; (2) 'consider something (acc.) as something'; (3) 'think fit or right'; (4) 'think upon,' 'set the heart upon'; (5) 'have in mind *or* in view.' [Cf. Gk. *me-mon-a*, 'mind,' i.e. 'fix the thoughts on,' 'wish,' 'strive'; and the indirectly connected Eng. 'mean.' [L.]

In the Rigveda the **mánas** is regarded as residing in the heart.

Mitra. The god so predominantly associated with Varuṇa that only one hymn is addressed to him alone. He dwells with Varuṇa in a palace in heaven and well nigh shares every particular of Varuṇa's activity. Comparing the hymn that concerns the two, Professor Macdonell finds the attribute 'bringing men together' proper to him. The name in Sanskrit means 'friend,' but Dr. E. J. Thomas says that the form of the word has never been explained. The conception, Dr. Thomas says, is that of a powerful, beneficent, being, conceived at a stage far beyond that of the deification of natural phenomena, and refers to the hymn RV. 3.59 to show that there is no evidence, but rather the contrary, for regarding him as a sun-god.[1]

Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, 'The Secret Teaching for the Shaven.'

muṇḍa, *adj.* 'having the head shaved,' 'bald.'

Thus we see that this Upaniṣad was not to be taught except to those who had their heads shaven, that is to monks.

Yājnavalkya, meaning 'descendant of Yajnavalkya,' the name of a sage mentioned in the **Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa** as an authority in ritual. He is said to have been the pupil of Uddālaka Āruni, a Brahmin of the Kuru-pancālas, who dwelt on the upper plain of the Jumna and Ganges. He is presented in the Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka Upanishad as holding disputations at the court

[1] *Vedic Hymns*, p. 60, where RV. 3.59 is translated.

of Janaka, the King of the Videhas, who lived much further east, in the region corresponding roughly to the modern Tirhut.[1]

Varuṇa. Professor Macdonell points out that from the oldest Rigvedic period Varuṇa and Indra tower above the rest of the gods as leading deities about equal in power. Varuṇa is the supreme moral ruler. Indra is the mighty warrior.[2] This predominance of moral qualities no doubt accounts for the fact he notes, that Varuṇa's personality is more fully developed on the moral than on the physical side. He has a face, eye, arms, hands and feet, and actively moves. Associated with him is Mitra, who dwells in Varuṇa's golden palace in heaven and rides with him in his car. The word **mitra** often means 'friend'[3] in the Rigveda, and so close is the character of Mitra to Varuṇa that, Professor Macdonell tells us, Mitra has, in the mention we find of him, hardly an independent trait left. Only a single hymn is addressed to him alone.[4] The car in which the two ride shines like the sun, and we find a poet praying (i.25.18) that he may see it on the earth.[5]

Varuṇa is not only the upholder of order (ṛta)[6] in nature, but also in morals. In him the three heavens and the three earths are deposited. His eye is the sun. He beholds all secret things, things that have been or shall be done. The very winkings of men's eyes are numbered by him, and whatever a man does, thinks, or devises, he knows. His wrath is roused by the infringement of his ordinances, an infringement which he severely punishes. Falsehood is frequently mentioned. Disease is inflicted on those who neglect their worship. On the other hand, Varuṇa is gracious. He unties the rope that binds the transgressor and removes the sin, even the rope from the sins of men's fathers. There is no hymn to Varuṇa (and the Ādityas[7]) in which the prayer for forgiveness of guilt does not occur, as in the hymns to the other deities it is prayer for worldly goods that is always presented.

The sun is the eye of Varuṇa. It is also the eye of his companion. In their golden abode in heaven, their spies sit round these two gods and behold the two worlds. The spies, acquainted with sacrifice, stimulate prayer. Thousand-eyed, they look across the world, descend and enter houses. This conception, says our scholar, may well have been suggested by the spies a strict ruler on earth has round him.[8]

Indra, on the other hand, is in the atmosphere, primarily the thunder-god, secondarily the god of battle. He is the god

[1] See *Vedic Index*, arts. "Uddālaka, Yājnavalkya, Videha."
[2] VM. p. 20.
[3] *Id.*, p. 30.
[4] *Id.*, p. 27.
[5] *Id.*, p. 23.
[6] See ṛta in Voc.
[7] See **Ādityas**, p. 199.
[8] Spies, however, Professor Macdonell points out, are not peculiar to Varuṇa and Mitra. They are also attributed to Agni, to demons, and to the gods in general. [VM. p. 23.]

of the strong arm. He is excessively fond of drinking soma. Under its influence he becomes intoxicated, boasts of his great and capricious deeds and is even driven to parricide, and also suffers from drinking to excess. Thus is Indra in moral status far below Varuṇa and the other great Indian gods.[1]

As to the course of Varuṇa as time went on, Professor Keith remarks that "the history of Indian religion is the history of the decadence of Varuṇa before the claims, on the one hand, of the warrior god Indra, the god *par excellence* of the Indian warrior, and, on the other hand, of Agni, the god of the sacrifice and of the sacrificial priest, and of Prajāpati, in whom the cosmological and pantheistic views of the priesthood found their expression."[2]

"With the growth of the conception of Prajāpati," Professor Macdonell tells us, "the characteristics of Varuṇa as a sovereign naturally faded away, and the dominion of the waters, only a part of his original sphere, alone remained to him in Post-Vedic mythology."[3]

See also Introduction, p. 9–.

vi-jnāna, 'discernment.'

From (*a*) **jnā,** 'know'; 'have knowledge of a person or thing,' 'recognise,' 'become aware of,' 'learn,' 'notice.'

(*b*) **vi,** preposition, 'apart,' 'asunder,' 'away,' 'out'; denoting intensity in descriptive compounds, and separation or non-agreement in possessive and prepositional compounds.

So **vi-jnā** means 'distinguish,' 'understand,' 'know,' 'recognise,' 'consider as,' 'observe,' 'find out.' [L.]

Belvalkar and Ranade understand it in the Sanatkūmara Exposition (CU. 7) to mean 'the act of intellectual solidarity,' which evidently is its meaning in Yājnavalkya's Speech to Maitreyī (Selection 13, BAU. 2.4=4.5). [CP. p. 230.]

Videhas. See **Janaka.**

Vi-rocana, 'The Shining One.'

The Chief of the demons in the Indra-Virocana story, Selection 15, CU. 8.7–12 [**rc,** 'shine' (cp. Gk. *leuk-os,* 'bright'; Lat. *lux* for *lūc-s,* 'light'; Eng. 'light') and **vi,** preposition, 'apart, asunder, out.'] [L.]

véda, *m.* (1) 'understanding,' 'knowledge'; (2) esp. 'the sacred knowledge,' handed down in the three collections of verse formula and chant, the Rig- Yajur-, and Sāma-vedas, respectively, held to be revealed, and hence called **śruti,** 'heard (from heaven,)' in contrast with other sayings handed down, which are simply **smṛti,** 'remembered (as the utterances of men).'

[1] VM., pp. 19, 64, 65.
[2] *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda,* p. 101.
[3] VM., p. 28.

[√**vid**, see: *perfect tense* **veda**, an old *preterite-present*, 'have seen *or* perceived,' and so, 'know.' Cp. Lat. *videre*, 'see'; with **veda** cp. Gk. *oida* and Eng. *I wot*, gerund *to wit*, noun *wit*, 'understanding.' [L.]

(*a*) **Ṛg-veda**, 'Sacred knowledge recited in hymns.'
ṛc, *f.* a hymn of praise. [Cp. **arká**, 'gleam.']
[√**ṛc**, beam; praise; sing (of the winds); honor.]

(*b*) **Yajur-veda**, 'sacred knowledge consisting of texts of the Rigveda to be muttered as formulae at the sacrifice.'
yajus, *n.* sacred awe, worship.
[√**yaj**, 'honor' a god, 'worship,' 'worship with prayer and oblation,' and so 'consecrate, hallow, offer,' 'sacrifice.' Cp. Gk. *hág-os*, 'worship,' 'sacred awe,' 'expiatory sacrifice.'] [L.]

(*c*) **Sāma-veda**, 'sacred knowledge consisting of texts of the Rigveda adapted for chanting.' **Sáman**, *n.* 'song.'

Śata-patha Brāhmaṇa, 'Sacred Directory of a Hundred [that is, very many] Paths [that is, Lectures[1]],' is, Prof. Macdonell tells us, the most important work in Vedic literature, next to the Rigveda. Its geographical data point to the land of the Kuru-Pancālas, where flow the upper Jumna and the upper reach of the Ganges, as the region where it was composed. As it is the longest it is also the latest of the Commentaries, Prof. Keith allocating it to shortly before the time of the Buddha, that is about 600 B.C. The Buddha lived from 563 to 483.

Śāṇḍilya, 'descendant of Śaṇḍila,' the patronymic of several teachers.

The 'Doctrine of Śāṇḍilya' (CU. 3.14, quoted on p. 87, occurs also as 'Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa,' 10.6.3, and in abbreviated form as BAU. 5.6). This Śāṇḍilya is the most important of the Śāṇḍilyas, and in that Brāhmaṇa is cited several times as an authority. His Agni or 'sacrificial fire' is there called 'Śāṇḍila.' From that it appears clearly that he was one of the great teachers of the fire ritual recounted in the fifth and following books of that Brāhmaṇa.[2]

Śveta-ketu ('white brightness'[3]), a Brahmin, son of Uddālaka. Macdonell and Keith tell us that Śvetaketu is repeatedly mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa,' and that in the 'Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa' he is quoted on the vexed question of the duty of the seventeenth priest appointed at the ritual of the Kauṣītakins to notify errors in the sacrifice. They add that he was a person of some originality, for he is described

[1] Macdonell, *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. II, p. 230.
[2] *Vedic Index*.
[3] **śvetá**, 'white,' cp. Gothic *hweits*, Eng. *white* [Macdonell, *Vedic Reader for Beginners*]. **ketu**, m. brightness; pl. beams [√cit, 'look, appear, shine,' cp. Gothic *haidu-s* ('appearance, manner,'' i.e.) 'way.' AS. *hād*, 'way, manner, condition.' Eng. *-hood*, *-head* (as in *maidenhood*, *godhead*), Ger. *-heit*. [L.]

in the Śatapatha as insisting on eating honey, a luxury prohibited to students of sacred lore. Like his father, he lived in the Kuru-Pancāla country in the upper plain of the Jumna and Ganges, which bordered on the country of the Kosala-Videhas. The Kuru-Pancāla-Brahmins were noted not only for their culture, but for their missionary activity, and we find Śvetaketu in the Śatapatha travelling about with fellow Brahmins in the Videhas country and figuring among the Brahmin disputants at the court of Janaka, the King.[1]

Macdonell and Keith further tell us that all references to Śvetaketu belong to the latest period of Vedic literature, and that it is therefore not surprising that the 'Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra' should refer to him as an **avara**, or person of later days, who nevertheless was regarded as a seer (**ṛṣi**) by special merit.[2]

(*a*) **sat** [for **as-at**].

1. *neut.* of **sant** [for **as-ant**], *participle* (of √**as**), being, existing.
2. *adj.* real, genuine, true, good.
3. (of people), good, noble, excellent.
4. **sat-ī**, *f.* a good, true, virtuous (wife), (hence Anglo-Indian Suttee).
5. *n.* the existent, existence.
6. **sat-kṛ**, make good, treat well, receive kindly.

√**as**. (1) 'be, exist'; 'be present or on hand'; 'take place, happen'; (2) 'be,' with predicate possessive genitive, signifies 'belong to'; **as-ti mama** (is of me, i.e. is mine, i.e.), 'I have.' Sanskrit has no verb for 'have.' [Cp. Lat. *es-t*, Eng. *is*.]

(*b*) **sat-tva**.

1. *n.* condition of being, beingness, existence, *essenti-a*.
2. *n.* condition of being good, absolutely good being, goodness, the highest of the three qualities of the universe.
3. *m. n.* 'a living being,' 'creature.'

[Formed from **sant**, just as the artificial Lat. *essent-ia*, 'beingness,' that on which a thing depends for being what it is,' from *essens*, a quasi-participle of *esse*.]

(*c*) **sat-yá**.

1. *adj.* 'real,' 'true,' 'existing in reality,' 'truthful, trusty, faithful.'
2. *neut.* **satyam**, 'the real,' 'the true,' 'reality,' 'truth,' 'truthfulness,' 'faithfulness.'

[Radically akin with Gk. *eteo-s*, 'true,' but of different formation, since the Cyprian shows that *eteos* stands for **eteFo-s*.]

The above analyses of Lanman's show that when we have **sat, sat-tva,** or **sat-yam** presented to us we have by no means a merely metaphysical term as Being was among the Eleatics, but a term having in it the significance of actual existence, life, high moral quality.

[1] *Śatapatha Brāhmana*, XI. 6.2.1.
[2] *Vedic Index*.

The context is to be looked at to give us the exact significance in any instance, but it is for us to notice initially the actuality and moral quality of the conception when we find Hindu philosophers deriving all things from **sat.**

Satya-kāma ('lover of truth': **satya,** truth (see **satya**)+**kāma,** 'wish, desire, longing'; 'love'; at end of possessive compounds, 'having desire for . . .,' 'desirous of . . .' √**kam,** 'wish, 'will,' 'desire,' 'love.' [L.]

Our Selection No. 7 describes Satyakāma's initiation by Hāri-drumata as a student of sacred lore, although his birth as a Brahmin was uncertified.

We find him come to be cited as an authority in doctrine in the Brihad-Āraṇyaka and Chāndogya Upanishads. He is also mentioned in the Aitareya and Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas.[1]

saṁ-sāra, the Wandering [of the soul from one body to another]. Literally 'surge' or 'flood.'

Derived from √**sṛ,** run swiftly, glide, flow [cp. Gk. *hor-mē,* rush, onset, spring, whence *hormaō,* rush on; *halma,* spring; Lat. *salire,* spring. [L.] Also compare Lat. *altus,* high; and Gaelic, *allt,* mountain stream; + **sam,** prep. 'together,' used to intensify the meaning of verbs. Thus **saṁ(s)kṛt,** Sanskrit, from √**kṛ,** perform, accomplish+**sam,** means the 'thoroughly-done, well-fashioned (language)'; and, here, **saṁsāra** the 'thorough wandering,' the 'constant irresistible flow or journeying' of the soul (from the acquirement of one body to the acquirement of another).

Belvalkar and Ranade bring forward beliefs in the Rigveda that imply the doctrine of re-embodiment, but they point out that is not until the end of the Brāhmaṇa period (which passed into the Upanishad period) that we find the doctrine definitely expressed. Its ultimate origin, whether it arose outside or within the Āryan immigrants into India, is a matter of controversy, they tell us; but 'the essential Āryan contribution to the full-fledged doctrine' they discover as coming, first, from the Āryan belief in pantheism or panpsychism, which made it possible to conceive of the soul inhabiting not only specific totems, but almost anything in the animate and inanimate creation; and, secondly, from the theory of Karma,[2] which the Āryans came to hold, and which regulated the soul's wanderings and gave the dogma a moral background.[3]

Hāri-drumata, 'descendant of Haridrumant.' The patronymic of the member of the Gautama family, who in our Selection No. 7 (CU. 4.4–9) accepts Satya-kāma as a pupil under him of sacred lore.

The literal meaning of Hari-drumant is 'connected with the **hari-dru,** 'hari-tree' (*Pinus deodara*).'

[1] *Vedix Index.* [2] See **karman** in Voc. [3] CP., p. 81.

Conclusion.

THE ONE PERFECT LIFE FOR ALL.

I. INTRODUCTION 230

II. THE ASSISTANCE BISHOP WESTCOTT HERE GIVES US 230

III. WESTCOTT ON THE QUALITY OF CHRISTIANITY .. 232

IV. WESTCOTT'S DEFINITION OF CHRISTIANITY .. 233

V. THE SCRIPTURES ON THE COINCIDENCE OF THE TRANSCENDENT AND THE EMPIRIC IN THE ONE PERFECT LIFE FOR US ALL 235

VI. THE PIONEERS' REPORT 238

VII. THE FALTERING OF THE EAGLE WINGS 239

VIII. YET, APARTNESS FROM THE HEIGHT IS INTOLERABLE 243

IX. THE REASON FOR THE WRETCHEDNESS AT SEPARATION IS THAT WE ARE SEPARATE FROM OUR TRUE SELF 244

X. A FURTHER SURVEY OF THE SELF. A NEW PARABLE: AN OCEAN 246

1. The Upper Depths: The Self so far Discerned: 246

(*a*) The Individuality of the Self, } Common 246
(*b*) The Universality of the Self, } qualities 250
(*c*) The Mutuality of the Self, } of the Self 251

(*d*) The Sinfulness of the Self: Peculiar to the Upper Depths 254

2. The Lower Depths: The Truth of the Self, even its Perfection, at last reached 256

(*a*) Now a Deeper Testing 256

(*b*) The Desire for Perfection 257

(*c*) The Necessity of Perfection for Existence 257

(*d*) The Cognizance of the Lower Depth .. 257

(i) By the Upanishad Fathers 257

(ii) By the Poet of the New Democracy 258

(iii) By the Irish Poet Æ 259

(iv) In the Bible 261

PAGE

XI. JESUS IS GIVEN BY GOD AS THE PERFECT SELF .. 262
(*a*) The First Feature: Individuality 264
(*b*) The Second Feature: Universality 264
(*c*) The Third Feature: Mutuality 265
(*d*) The Fourth Feature: Perfection 267
Other Features: (*e*) Creative Power, (*f*) Restorative Power 271

XII. THE TRUE HEIGHT OF MAN 272

XIII. HOW THE 'WAITING SEED' HAS BEEN BROUGHT TO ITS FLOWER 274
(*a*) The True Nature of Man 274
(*b*) The Assay of the Archetype.. 276
(*c*) God's remedy to make good the failure of the flesh to reproduce the archetype was the revelation that the archetype had been reproduced in the flesh, even in Jesus 278

XIV. THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT 278
(*a*) The psychic is itself neutral as regards morality; but, when free will came to be introduced into it, the need for a moral decision was at once laid upon it 278
(*b*) We are taught that a man's nature is either good or bad 279
(*c*) The de-vitalised archetype (the 'waiting seed') needs to be quickened by the Spirit .. 280
(*d*) The contrast between the Flesh, as it has come to be in man, and the Spirit 281
(*e*) The position St. Paul takes with regard to the Flesh 282
(*f*) The Flesh in him who puts on the new man is entirely forsaken. The whole man is now filled with the Spirit. Of the Spirit alone he takes cognizance and is completely under its rule 283
(*g*) Yet the Flesh has its glory 284
(*h*) And yet the body awaits redemption .. 285
(*i*) The Spirit is a means to efficiency 286

XV. THE SUCCESSIVE DEPTHS OF THE SELF REVIEWED FOR OURSELVES 287
(*a*) The Degenerate Self 287
(*b*) The Self in its true manifestation 294
(*c*) The Ultimate 295

XVI. THE SELF CREATIVE 301

XVII. MIND AND LIFE IN THE UNIVERSE 304

XVIII. THE WORLD-PERSON IS LOVE 309

PAGE

XIX. WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED OF THE GLORY OF THE SELF 314
(*a*) What Walt Whitman has shown us .. 314
(*b*) What the Upanishad Men of the Spirit discovered 316
(*c*) The Bible revelation 317
(*d*) Only the last of the three unveilings of the glory of the Self satisfies 317

XX. OUR FINAL VIEW OF THE WORLD IN THE LIGHT OF WHAT HAS BEEN TOLD US 318

I. INTRODUCTION.

We have presented to the reader, in our Introduction to the Selections, a sketch of the Sacred Tradition of the Āryans and of the Secret Lore which was its climax. What now of Christianity?

II. THE ASSISTANCE BISHOP WESTCOTT HERE GIVES US.

Brooke Foss Westcott was Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge from 1870 to 1890, and then became Bishop of Durham, and, still in active work as bishop, died in 1901. He was easily the most looked-to-for-guidance and inspiring theologian of his day. He combined in a wonderful way the most minute word-for-word study of the text of the Greek Testament and attention to detail in whatever he undertook with ascent, like a ready mountaineer, to a height from which he could descry and describe for those below the true character of the detailed landscape in which they found themselves.

In the mystery of the Incarnation he found the key that unlocked all other mysteries of Being and Life, and multitudes of folk—both those who had thought little and those who had thought much—received insight and uplift from his teaching thereon. That during his professorship at Cambridge Westcott had come to know much regarding Indian thought in general, the extracts we give from his writings as Appendix V will sufficiently testify. When,

however, we peruse his book entitled the *Gospel of Life*, which contains the substance of lectures he gave during that time to specially keen students upon Christian doctrine, we find that, when he discusses Hinduism as one of the "Prae-Christian Solutions of the Problems of Being," while he is well up to his date as regards his knowledge of the Veda and Brāhmaṇas, and speaks of two great philosophical schools, the Vedānta (by which he may mean the authentic Vedānta presented in the Upanishads, but most probably means subsequent systemisations thereof) and the Sānkhya, characterising these two schools as presenting "the profound speculations of the few, and as witnesses for the loftier strivings and the sad hopelessness of men, standing over against the declining polytheism like the systems of Plato and Aristotle,"[1] yet he does not mention the Upanishads.

This non-acquaintance of the learned Professor with the Upanishads we can readily understand when we note that it was not until 1897, seven years after Westcott's Professorship was over, that Paul Deussen published a translation of the Upanishads into a European tongue, German; and not until 1900, a year before Westcott's death, that the first translation into English, Max Müller's, appeared.

What specially concerns us, however, in our present study, is the definition Westcott gives of Christianity in the above-mentioned lectures. It is a definition which, to his mind, presented the teaching of Holy Scripture expressed in a form which the modern mind would appreciate. What is remarkable for us is its coincidence with the teaching of the Upanishads, as will be presently shown to the reader. Consequently the non-acquaintance we have pointed out of Westcott with these documents while he was delivering these Lectures enables us to reckon him an unbiassed witness to the said coincidence.

After his Cambridge period, however, Westcott came to know at least so much of the Upanishads as to mention them in a Tabulation in the *Cambridge Companion to the Bible*, published in 1892, and to describe them as "containing passages of the highest speculative interest, inquiries into creation, being, metempsychosis, etc., and as giving rise to the six systems of Hindu philosophy."

[1] *Gospel of Life*, p. 157.

In these later years indeed there was an additional acquaintance for him with India through correspondence with the four out of his five sons that had taken up mission-work there, and it was in this later period of his life that the saying came to be attributed to him (which, whether genuine or not, well accords with his keenness to learn regarding Indian thought and his opinion as to the agency through which he thought such knowledge would best be gained), that it was much to be desired that an Indian Christian should present and estimate for the consideration of the West what was the teaching of the Upanishads.

We do not wish to assert that Westcott would have given a complete consent to Upanishad teaching. Our one point is—and we believe that our reader will come to agree with us—that Westcott's definition of Christianity does in a remarkable degree help those who contemplate it to appreciate, if not also to criticise, the main teaching of the Indian Forest Fathers with whom we are concerned.

III. WESTCOTT ON THE QUALITY OF CHRISTIANITY.

(*a*) Christianity is Absolute.

Before we state Westcott's Definition of Christianity, however, let us notice what the quality was that he claimed for Christianity. Christianity "is absolute," he said. "It is not confined by any limits of space or time or faculty or object. It reaches to the whole sum of being and to the whole of each separate existence."

And thus he worked out his statement: "Christianity is absolute. It claims, as it was set forth by the Apostles, though the grandeur of the claim was soon obscured, to reach all men, all time, all creation; it claims to effect the perfection no less than the redemption of finite being; it claims to bring a perfect unity of humanity without destroying the personality of any one man; it claims to deal with all that is external as well as all that is internal, with matter as well as with spirit, with the physical universe as well as with the moral universe; it claims to realise a re-creation co-extensive with creation; it claims to present Him who was the Maker of the world as the Heir of all things (Heb. i.

2); it claims to complete the cycle of existence, and to show how all things come from God and go to God (Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. xv. 28)."[1]

(*b*) Christianity is Actual.

Further, it will be already seen by what we have just quoted that for Westcott Christianity, while absolute in the sense of not being confined within the limits of space and time, was yet within these limits manifested. Absolute it was, but also actual. Of that he thus writes: "We have here the interpretation of events in the life of One who was truly Man. Christianity is not a theory, a splendid guess, but a proclamation of facts."[2] "*The Word*, we read, *became flesh*."[3] He notes consequently 'the terrible contrast' between 'man's power' and 'man's achievement.' "No one can look," he says, "either within or without and fail to see clear marks not only of imperfection, but of failure.[4] But"—and here is his point—"Christ as he lived and lives, justifies our highest hope. It was, we read in St. Paul, the good pleasure of God 'to sum up all things in Christ,'[5] and 'through Him to reconcile all things to Himself'[6]. "[7]

IV. WESTCOTT'S DEFINITION OF CHRISTIANITY.

'Absolute' and 'actual'! How then does Christianity resolve what appears to be at first sight a dualism irreconcilable?

It does so, Westcott maintains (proving his point by bringing forward the texts we have already adduced and others) by being 'a life' (and here comes what we call "Westcott's Definition of Christianity"), "*the One Perfect Life*." On that he expresses himself thus: "The Gospel is the revelation, the gift, the power, of a perfect human life, offered to God and received by God, in which every single human life finds its accomplishment."[8] In another passage he puts it this way: "Christianity is not an abstraction, not simply a participation in a common nature, but a life which is (as

[1] *Religious Thought in the West*, p. 345–; also on p. 248 of the *Gospel of Life*.

[2] *Id.*, p. 345. [3] *Id.*, p. 348. [4] *Id.*, p. 349. [5] Eph. i. 10.

[6] Col. i. 20. [7] *Religious Thought in the West*, p. 350.

[8] *Gospel of Life*, p. 256.

we apprehend it) personal (compare Eph. iv. 15–)," being "the union of believers in one Person, a vaster life than that which is realised individually; a life in which humanity becomes one."[1] "Here is the *One* [Westcott's italics]," he says elsewhere, "in whom all men find their fragmentary being capable of reconciliation in a higher Personality."[2] Thus was Christianity, he eagerly maintained, the fulfilment of what we read in the First Chapter of Genesis, "man made in God's own image and after his likeness,"[3] the appointed "sovereign of the world."[4] He noted the passage in Colossians[5] where Christ is declared to be 'all things and in all,'[6] and gave this as his comment: "Whatever is, He is. There is but one life."[7]

And he draws as follows his deductions of what this One Perfect Life means for the individual, for mankind, and for nature.

First, with regard to the individual: "The Person of the Lord includes all that belongs to the perfection of every man; meets us at every point in our strivings; and discloses something to call out in us loftier endeavour. The Spirit of Christ brings the power through which each one can reach his true end. As we contemplate Him, our sense of His perfections grows with our own moral advance. As our power of vision is disciplined and purified, we see more of His beauty."[8]

Next he portrays what the One Perfect Life means for mankind: "In the Lord's humanity is included not only whatever belongs to the consummation of the individual, but also to the consummation of the race, in all stages of its progress in regard to the whole inheritance of our nature, enlarged by the most vigorous use while the world lasts. It is true, I believe, without exception, in every realm of man's activity, true in action, true in literature, true in art, that the works which receive the most lasting homage of the soul are those which are the most Christian, and that it is in each work the element which answers to the fact of the Incarnation—that is, to the fellowship of God

[1] *Id.*, pp. 232–4, being deductions from Acts xvii. 24–30, Gal. iii. 26, Col. iii. 11.
[2] *Id.*, p. 56.
[3] Gen. i. 27, 28.
[4] *Gospel of Life*, p. 242.
[5] Col. iii. 11.
[6] Westcott's translation.
[7] *Gospel of Life*, p. 234.
[8] *Id.*, p. 300.

with man as an accomplished reality of the present order—which attracts and holds our reverence."[1]

And thus he writes with regard to nature: "In the fulfilment Christ has brought of the destiny of man lies the hope also of the material world. Something is in store for it, we gather, answering to the redemption of man's body. Christ is shown in Holy Scripture to stand essentially in some ineffable yet real connection with all finite being. The whole tenor of revelation, as I conceive it, leads us to regard the Incarnation as involved inherently in Creation. There is a prospect of a holy unity which shall hereafter crown and fulfil creation, as one revelation of Infinite Love when 'according to his purpose' the Father has 'summed up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth.' "[2]

V. THE SCRIPTURES ON THE COINCIDENCE OF THE TRANSCENDENT AND THE EMPIRIC IN THE ONE PERFECT LIFE FOR ALL.

This meeting of the Absolute and the Actual, in the One Perfect Life, in fact, their constituting it; how marvellous it is! Yet we see that it must be. If the life were not in the absolute it could not be perfect. If it were not in the actual, there would then be no moving or doing.

In the following manner the Scriptures bring the double aspect before us.

St. John the Evangelist tells us: "In the beginning the Word was with God and was God and through Him all things came into existence," that in him was 'life,' and 'the life' was the "light of men."[3] Yet he goes on to declare that the Word 'became flesh,'[4] and throughout his gospel Jesus is described as 'a man.'[5] The Jews murmur that one 'whose father and mother they know'[6] should say, "I am the bread come down out of heaven." In the opening of the First Epistle the transcendence of the Word

[1] *Gospel of Life*, pp. 299–301.
[2] *Thoughts on Revelation and Life*, from B. F. Westcott, Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, edited by Stephen Phillips, p. 244–.
[3] John i. 1–4. [4] *Id.*, i. 14.
[5] *Id.*, i. 30; iv. 29; vii. 46; viii. 40; ix. (*passim*); x. 33; xi. 47, 50; xviii. (*passim*); xix. 5.
[6] *Id.*, vi. 42; cp. i. 45.

who became flesh is still emphasised (for he is described as 'the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father'), but no less is the 'coming in the flesh' insisted on, the writer stating to his readers, "that which we have heard, have seen with our eyes, and our hands handled, that declare we unto you."[1]

Further, we have in St. John's gospel not only the miracles Jesus wrought which he tells the Jews are the works of his Father in him, which so astonished all men, and were, we are told, signs to his disciples of his glory; not only are we told of 'authority in himself' being bestowed upon him by the Father, and wonderful control over matter being his, such as walking on the water; but he is also presented to us as a traveller 'wearied with his journey,' who rests by a well asking one who comes to draw water to appease therefrom his thirst.

On the one hand we hear Jesus say, "Before Abraham was, I am"[2]; and, more wonderful still, "I and the Father are one"; and yet, on the other hand, the Jews who had taken up stones to cast at him, give as a reason for their anger: "For a good work we stone thee not, but because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."[3] But the Lord does not withdraw his divinity nor his humanity. He answers: "Is it not written in your law, I said Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken), say ye of him whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?"[4] That is

[1] 1 John i. 1–3.
[2] *Id.*, viii. 58. (Moffatt translates "I have existed before Abraham was born.")
[3] *Id.*, x. 30, 33.
[4] *Id.*, 34–36.
"I said, Ye are gods."—Ps. lxxxii. 6.
The last three verses of the Psalm are thus translated by Professor Driver in his *Parallel Psalter:*

6. '*I* said, "Ye are gods,
and all of you sons of the Most High
7. But in truth ye shall die like men,
and fall like one of the princes."
8. Arise, O God, judge the earth
for *thou* hast an inheritance in all the nations.'

Professor Briggs, in his *Commentary on the Psalms*, explains that in this Psalm God is presented as standing in the midst of the governors (here called 'gods') of the nations who are holding exiled Israel in subjection. He is giving sentence against them for their unjust judgment and their lack of defending the poor and needy among His people.

to say, having announced divinity for himself, a sharing in divinity he claims for men, namely for those mentioned in the Scripture he quoted.

Indeed the Evangelist declares in the First Epistle that the means by which the Spirit of God shall be known to speak in a Christian teacher is the Spirit's confession that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh: if the Spirit in the teacher does not so confess, the Spirit speaking in him is not of God, but is of the Anti-Christ.[1]

We turn over the pages of other Scripture and we find the same coincidence. The Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of Jesus being 'in all points tempted like as we are, and yet without sin';[2] the Epistle to the Ephesians—of Christ as one in whom 'all things are summed up, the things in the heaven and the things upon the earth,' and yet as 'having been raised from the dead,' and evidently therefore having been subject to mortality[3]; the Epistle to the Colossians, on which the Epistle to the Ephesians is based, gives wonderful detail as to 'all things being created in him—thrones, dominions, principalities, powers'—yet speaks of 'the body of his flesh' and of his 'death'[4]; the Epistle to the Romans describes him as "Of the seed of David according to the flesh,' yet declares him to have been 'declared'[5] [by God] the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by his being raised [by God] from the dead."[6]

When we pass to the Synoptic Gospels we find therein the same insistence on the union of the transcendent and the empiric. In them Jesus is brought forward as of the genealogy of David, yet with no human father, but of the

Westcott, in his *Commentary on St. John*, at the place where this Psalm is quoted, makes this noteworthy comment: "Such a phrase as that in Psalm lxxxii. 6, really includes in a most significant shape the thought which underlies the whole of the Old Testament, namely that of a covenant between God and man, which through the reality of a *personal relationship* [italics by the writer now quoting] assumes the possibility of a vital union. Judaism was not a system of limited monotheism, but a theism always tending to theanthropism, to a real union of God and man. It was, therefore, enough to shew in answer to the accusation of the Jews that there lay already in the Law the germ of the truth which God announced, the union of God and man."

[1] 1 John iv. 2, 3. [2] Heb. iv. 15. [3] Eph. i. 10, 20.

[4] Col. i. 16–22.

[5] 'declared,' RV.; Greek *horistheis*, translated 'appointed' in Grimm-Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament*, and 'determined' in margin of RV.

[6] Rom. i. 4.

Holy Spirit begotten[1] and being indeed *'God with us'*[2]; circumcised the eighth day; having the Most High for his Father, yet brought by his parents to the passover at Jerusalem; verily dead and buried, and women going with spices to embalm his body from immediate decay, yet meeting the women as they return from the empty tomb with the cry 'All Hail'; declared, in the gospel of St. Luke and in the Acts, to be taken up after his resurrection into heaven and received by a cloud out of his disciples' sight; and, as such, afterwards proclaimed to have been exalted to the right hand of God, as one whom the heaven must receive until the restoration of all things.[3]

VI. THE PIONEERS' REPORT.

Let us now come back to our eager thinkers in the Forest of Hindustan.

Let us recollect what we have heard them say.

First, we found Śāṇḍilya announcing in his Creed,[4] "This whole world is spirit. The person consists of purpose. He who is made of mind; whose body is life, whose form light, whose conception truth, his body (**ātman**) the space overhead, containing all works, all desires, encompassing this whole world—this soul of mine within the heart is smaller than the kernel of a grain of millet, yet greater than the earth, than the atmosphere, than the sky, than these worlds."

Does not this recall what we have just quoted from St. John regarding the 'Word' of Creation, which 'became flesh'? 'Purpose' and 'mind' (especially when we remember that in Sanskrit **manas** (mind) denotes not only reason, but emotion and will) bespeak the 'Word.' The very terms of St. John are here—'life,' 'light,' 'truth': so too such declarations as we found in Colossians and Ephesians regarding 'all things in him.'

Again, take Uddālaka's announcement to his son: "That which is the finest essence. This whole world is that which has That for its soul. That is reality. That is the Self.

[1] Matt. i. 20, That which is begotten in her [the mother of Jesus] is of (**ek** 'from, out of') the Holy Spirit (RV. margin).
[2] *Id.* i. 23. [3] Acts ii. 33; iii. 21. [4] CU. 3.14 (p. 87).

That are thou, O Śvetaketu."[1] Do not these statements give us the same universal qualities?

And has not the most famous of Uddālaka's pupils, Yājnavalkya, shown us the transcendent still more clearly when, placing his hand on his breast, he declared: "This Self, the light in the heart, he is the great Unborn, in whom are all things, from whom are all things, the one seer, taster, speaker, thinker, understander, in himself existent. Herein is immortality"?

VII. THE FALTERING OF THE EAGLE WINGS.

The mountain of the world's desire!—the Seat of the Ruler, the very awfulness and height of which attract, as our eyes travel up, and regarding which we say in our heart of hearts, Thither would I ascend, and there be enthroned —Am I not born a citizen free, no slave, but king in and over the world in which I now find myself?

Here are our Forest Hermits, in we know not how long a succession, surveying the height and finding themselves there.

Here are also our Christian seers. For them too a long education, more full and diverse than that of the Forest Hermits. We may note its stages. First the intuition that the nation or the king was to God as a son to a Father. Then the revelation that God had made man at the beginning "in His own image and after His likeness." Then that men as men were held to be sons of the heavenly Father. Then Jesus comes before us, ascending out of the water of his baptism, seeing "the heavens rent asunder and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him, while a Voice came out of the heavens: 'Thou are my beloved Son, in thee I am well-pleased'[2]; who has been given to us as the Perfect Son; who could say to the Jews 'which of you convicteth me of sin?'[3]; who was ever obedient to the Father's will; in whom therefore as the true image and likeness at last of the Father, all the begotten of God are enabled, if they abide in him, to bring forth (as we learn in the Parable of the Vine[4]) that fruit of perfection which the Father requires.

[1] CU. 6.8.7. (p. 111).
[2] Mark i. 10, 11.
[3] John viii. 46.
[4] John xv, 1—8.

Here then is man at last in his true height, the height at which God created him. For the Eagle Evangelist this was the "witness that God hath borne concerning his Son." Not to accept it "made God a liar." "The witness was this," he tells us, "that God gave unto us eternal life and this life is in his Son."[1] The Father indeed "only," we are told in the First Epistle to Timothy, "hath immortality."[2] Nevertheless St. John declares of the Son that "as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son to have life in himself;[3] and this further, of those that have the Son: "He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son, hath not the life."[4]

But the eagle-wings falter. Not of St. John. We have noticed how unflinchingly and with what unambiguous contrast of the empiric he keeps the humanity abreast of the height and declares that it is just in that height that it has its home and its origin. The Word which was not only "with God," but "was God," "became flesh," was beheld as "a man."

So the evangelist. But, looking elsewhere, we discover that the height and the eagle are *not* found together.

Take, first, our very Upanishad prospectors with all their insistence on the closeness of the transcendent and the empiric. We find indeed Śāṇḍilya saying: "This whole world is spirit. The Person is made up of purpose, of mind. His body is life, his form light. His conception is truth. All works, all desires [and so on] he contains. This whole world he encompasses. He is spirit. He is within my heart, smaller than the kernel of a grain of millet, greater than the worlds. Into him I shall enter on departing hence." And we have noticed how Uddālaka and Yājnavalkya both hold that the self that is in all of us is none else than the great Self of all. Yet for these Eastern sages the Self is **alipta**[5] (unattaching and unattached), and to such an extent that he is indifferent to good as well as to evil. So are the transcendent and the empiric, after all not incorporate.

[1] 1 John v. 9–11. [2] 1 Tim. vi. 16. [3] John v. 26. [4] 1 John v. 12.

[5] **a-lipta**: **a**, privative prefix, and **liptá**, past participle of √lip, (1) besmear, rub over a thing with a thing; (2) smear a thing over or on a thing; stick (trans.) onto. Cp. Gk. *to lipos*, grease, *a-leiph-ō*, anoint; *liparos*, greasy, shiny. [L.]

So, there is not with these Forest Philosophers 'the Word that was with God and was God' becoming 'flesh'; not the 'taking of the manhood into God,' as the Athanasian Creed puts it. There is no Incarnation.

Next, if the Forest Fathers with such apprehension as they had of the Transcendent felt that it must be 'unattaching and unattached' to the human life in which it dwelt, much more can we readily understand that the Jews, with their God of awful mystery and purity, should shrink from the thought of any attachment of God to humanity. We are therefore not surprised when we find that, when the startling revelation of the Incarnation—of "the Word who was with God and was God" becoming "flesh," "a man" —was proclaimed among these, indignation should seize them and that they should take up stones to cast at him who declared it of himself, exclaiming: "Not for a good work do we stone thee, but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."[1]

We can realise further that with men of such a mind, be they Jews, or Gentiles that had come to accept the Jewish revelation of the majesty of God, even though they became Christian, the eagle wings should still falter. The "becoming flesh" would constitute a serious offence. We can forecast that among them men should arise, who, while, as Christians, they accepted as the gospel for the world that the Son of God had come and shown himself in a body, should yet teach that his body was not actual but only in appearance.

But we have noticed what St. John wrote regarding these last. They were for him 'false prophets.'[2] The Spirit in them was not of God. It was "the spirit of the Anti-Christ already come into the world." It was to maintain the actuality of the Lord as verily a man that he wrote his gospel in which the Lord is declared to be the Word 'become flesh,' and described as 'a man,' as one who was 'heard, seen, and handled.'

These men came to be called Docetae from the Greek *dokein*,[3] 'to seem,' seeing that for them the body of Jesus had only *seemed* to exist. But there were certain men who,

[1] John x. 33. [2] 1 John iv. 3.

[3] See article "Docetism," p. 835b, in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.

like these, deemed themselves Christians and who *did* believe in the reality of the flesh of Jesus, and yet are fairly classed by the historian as Docetae, because they held a view similar to the alipta doctrine of the Upanishad fathers, namely, the thorough apartness in Jesus of the spiritual from the psychic. Such was Valentinus who contended that the spiritual in Jesus passed through the psychic "just as water flows through a tube." That is to say, the spiritual had nothing whatever to do with the psychic. It was "unconcerned," as Śāṇḍilya said; "unattaching and unattached," to quote the description of Yājnavalkya.

But the Church would not part with the actuality of the Perfect Man. All these teachers she condemned as heretics. In fact, it was her condemnation of them and her consequent distinction from them, that commenced that consolidation of believers in the Incarnation that we know as the Catholic Church.

Nevertheless there came a juncture later when many leaders of the Catholic Church itself refused to stay at the height. In the beginning of the fourth century Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, and those who thought with him, expressed their denial, not of the actuality of the flesh of Jesus, but that, being the Logos ('reason'), the Logos took the place in him of the soul, and hence denied that he was man in man's proper completeness.[1] And they laid stress on his designation as the *Son* of the Father, and then maintained that, since he was Son and a son is after a father, therefore "there was when he was not,"[2] thus denying his eternity, and, consequently, that he was really God. But Athanasius, the chief of the deacons in the same Alexandria, arose to be champion for the faith as St. John had announced it, and brought the Church to incorporate in what has proved to be the foundation-creed of the Church, the Nicene, a decisive clause against the Arians—'of one substance with the Father,' as our English Prayerbook translates the Greek, or (to give the literal translation) 'of the same being[3] with the Father'—which,

[1] See Weigl: *Christologie d.h. Athanasius*, p. 10.

[2] Article "Arianism," in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

[3] 'being.' Professor Bethune-Baker points out with regard to the Greek word, which is *ousia*, that "it means the inmost being of the Father,

since it states the identity of essence of the Son with Father, proclaims the essential Godhead of Jesus.

VIII. YET, APARTNESS FROM THE HEIGHT IS INTOLERABLE.

Great then is the height. Here is the Word that was 'with God in the beginning and was God,' through whom 'all existence came into being,'[1] become 'flesh,' become 'a man,' as St. John proclaims in his Prologue and Gospel—become 'the Self' as we know it, as the Upanishad fathers well designate a man, fastening thus upon the essential that makes each of us 'a man'—'seen with our eyes and with our hands handled,' as St. John proceeds to say in the First Epistle.

Great the height, yet all through the ages we find men declare that apartness from that height of all heights is intolerable.

Our Forest Fathers thus express themselves. In the Taittirīya Upanishad we find: "In the beginning from the non-existent was Being (**sat**) produced, which itself made itself a Self, which is the essence[2] [of existence]. On getting the essence one becomes blissful. Who would live if this bliss of the infinite (*lit.* space overhead) did not exist? Truly this essence causes bliss. But let one make a cavity, an interval, therein, then he comes to have fear."[3] In the Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest we have, at a great gathering of Brahmins, King Janaka had called

his very self. The translation 'substance,' which comes to us through the Latin, is not satisfactory; 'essence' hardly conveys to English ears the real meaning; and 'nature'—though 'nature' is certainly included in the sense—is quite inadequate by itself. 'Being' is the nearest equivalent we have. The phrase is intended to mark the distinct personality of the Son on the one hand—he is in himself, he has his own existence; while, on the other hand, it declares that he has his existence from no source external to the Father, but is of the very being of the Father and belongs to his being—so that the Father himself is not, does not exist, is not to be conceived of as having being, apart from the Son. . . . Of nothing originate could it be said that it was 'from the *essence* of God.' But the essence of the Father is the sphere of being of the Son. He is inseparable from the essence of the Father. To say 'of the essence of God' is the same thing as to say 'of God' in more explicit language."—*The Meaning of Homoousios*, J. F. Bethune-Baker, p. 61.

[1] John i. 3 (Moffatt's translation).

[2] 'essence,' **rása**, *m.*, the sap *or* juice of plants, *esp.* of fruits; *and so*, the best *or* finest *or* strongest part of a thing, its essence *or* flos. [L.]

[3] TU. 2.7.

together, desiring to know which of them was the most learned student, two inquirers asking Yājnavalkya to explain "Him who is the Spirit (**brahman**) present and not beyond our ken, who is the Self in all things." To the first inquirer he describes him as "he who breaths with your breathing, your self." To the next he further describes him as "he who passes beyond hunger and thirst, beyond sorrow and delusion, beyond old age and death." And to each he gives as his parting word: "Aught else than this Self (**ātman**) is wretched."[1]

And where shall we find the misery of apartness from God more passionately expressed than in the Bible? Thus the Psalmists: "My soul thirsteth for Thee, my flesh also longeth after Thee in a barren and dry land where no water is."[2] "As the hart panteth after the waterbrooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. . . . When shall I come and appear before God."[3] "Thou art the thing that I long for. Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of thee?"[4]

With different apprehensions of the nearness, the cry repeats itself down the ages in such words as we find in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine: "Thou hast created us unto thyself, and our heart finds no rest until it rests in Thee."[5]

IX. THE REASON FOR THE WRETCHEDNESS AT SEPARATION IS THAT WE ARE SEPARATE FROM OUR TRUE SELF.

But why this wretchedness at separation? If the height is so awful when we gaze up at it, how can it be that we should yearn to be there, yea to be as close as we can, even, if only that may be, identified with it?

The reason we find expressed, or implied, in the disclosure that we have just been relating made in the announcements of our Indian sages and in the New Testament that, as we look up, terrible although the majesty is, we have the strange conviction that the Height is our own true self. Immeasurably beyond us—so immeasurably that we must

[1] BAU. 3.4, 5.
[2] Ps. lxiii. 2 (Prayer Book Version).
[3] *Id.*, xlii. 1, 2 (RV.).
[4] *Id.*, lxxiii. 24 (PBV.).
[5] *Confessions of Saint Augustine*, i. 1. Trans. Charles Bigg, D.D.

bow in worship before it—and yet of the measure appointed for us! Up there, each of us feels, nay is certain, is *himself*, himself—his conscience will warn him—as he *ought* to be.

That is the discovery made known in secret, yet so determinately, by our quiet Forest-thinkers as their gospel to such of their pupils as they deemed fit to receive it. "That are thou," we have heard Uddālaka say to his son. Yājnavalkya we have just quoted declaring to an inquirer, "He who breathes with your breathing is the Self of yours which is in all things."[1] At the same great gathering of Brahmins where he thus answered an inquirer, another questioner, none less than Uddālaka, his teacher of old, asked him whether he knew "the thread, the so-called Inner Controller, by which this world and the other world and all things are tied together, for he that had that knowledge knew the Spirit (**brahman**), the worlds, the gods, the Vedas, created things, the Self, everything?" To which the sage, become a famous authority, replied: "He who, dwelling in all things, controlling all things, yet other than all, and not known by any, is your Self, the Inner Controller, the Immortal."[2] And we read in the *Secret Teaching in the Chant* that five great householders, who had been pondering Who is the Self? What is Spirit? went to this same Uddālaka as to one who they knew was 'studying exactly' the Self that belongs to all men, and he took them to another student of the Self, King Aśva-pati. Aśva-pati, because he was not a Brahmin, would not receive these six inquirers as pupils. But, after having made clear his reverence for them and the sacrifice, he gave them the result of his meditations thus: "You who inquire of me eat food in *this world only*, knowing as you do this Self that is found in all men as if something separate [from each of you as an individual], but he who reverences this Universal Self as of the size of a span thus [here the king stretched his fingers across his forehead] as measured upon one's self [or 'by thinking about one's self'],[3] he eats food in *all* worlds, in *all* beings, in *all* selves."[4]

[1] BAU. 3.4. (p. 244). [2] BAU. 3.7.

[3] Explaining these alternative renderings, 'measured upon one's self,' 'by thinking about one's self,' Hume points out that the word here, **abhi-vi-māna**, may be derived either from √**mā**, to measure, or from √**man**, to think, or indeed may be intended to 'pregnantly refer to both.'

[4] CU. 5.18.1.

X. A FURTHER SURVEY OF THE SELF. A NEW PARABLE: AN OCEAN.

1. The Upper Depths: The Self so far Discerned.

Let us then embark upon this ocean of the Self, and take, as experts to do the testing for us, these Indian philosophers, certain mystic English poets, and the Bible.

Certain characteristics we find these several authorities reporting, that are of interest to us now, the first (let us so order them) Individuality; the second, Universality; the third, Mutuality. These are found throughout the whole ocean. But we have to notice that there are two grades of it, the upper in a disturbed condition, the lower—placid. The disturbing power in the upper waters let us take as an emblem of sin; and the placidity as an emblem of purity. So, two other characteristics of humanity, besides these just mentioned, we shall have to consider, Sinfulness and Perfection, the first a characteristic of the upper depths, evident at once, a characteristic of man as we find him; the second, of the lower depths, not easy to see, yet a necessary feature, man as he ought to be.

(*a*) *The Individuality of the Self.*

First, then, Individuality.

Individuality. By that we mean the self-containedness of the self. It is its nature that it should be self-contained. All beside it, even each of those whom it deems to be self as itself, is objective. As self the self is alone, unique, none capable of being placed by it in its stead. No one else is there. And it is the centre of a sphere possessing a limitless periphery. That is the experience of each of us.

The dependence of the self on itself alone is certainly a moral experience. The self holds itself alone to be responsible for its acts.

Negatively, this means that the self has nothing outside itself. To recognise anything as being outside itself would be to deny its own constitution.

(i) *The Upanishads.*

That aspect of the Self is well, although strangely, displayed in our Second Selection.[1]

[1] P. 54.

According to that Brāhmaṇic account, Death, being emptiness, covered the world at the beginning. There could only be emptiness, for that was at the beginning of things. But, argues the Upanishad, emptiness is hunger. So Death, being hunger, desired for himself a body that should be his food, that is a body that should satisfy his craving to be filled. It was that desire that set all creation a-going. Not all at once does Death produce a body that satisfies him, but at last he does so. On that body (come to be, alas! as the reader knows, in very unsatisfactory form) he feeds. As he produces it, he draws it back again into himself. But behold he feels pride in the fulness that now becomes his arise within him. At once he discerns that to entertain such a sentiment is to be untrue to himself. So he passes the body he has thus acquired into nothingness —subjects it to fire—before he may receive it. He has thus effected that he is in the condition of receiving nothing, is being filled with nothing, has returned in fact to his original and true nature, which requires him to rest in himself alone.

Here is (according to the interpretation we have ventured to give of the Upanishad) the body of entire self-surrender, the spiritual body, the body, which St. Paul teaches us (as we will presently bring before the reader) is the body of the true man, the man out of heaven who is made in the Creator's image and after his likeness.

Here, then, is the self-containedness of the Self. Self-containedness may be said to be the most prominent characteristic of the Self in the teaching of the Upanishad Fathers. The characteristic is summed by them in the epithet well-known to students of their teaching, **svayaṁ-bhū** ('in himself existing').

We have quoted in our Notes Professor Schayer's insistence that it is just the self as each of us knows it in his own bosom that these sages have in mind, no abstract Ego.[1]

(ii) *Walt Whitman.*

It is this individuality, uniqueness, self-containedness, of the Self, its centrality for each of us in the midst of the one limitless world, that is the message of the enthusiastic American, Walt Whitman, to his fellow men. In his preface

[1] P. 179.

to his First Edition[1] of his collected poems, which he published in continuously enlarged form under the title *Leaves of Grass*, he thus describes his mission as a poet and his view of the importance of the individual: "Most of the great poets are impersonal. I am personal. . . . In my poems all revolves round, concentrates in, radiates from myself. I have but one central figure, the general human personality typified in myself. But my book compels, absolutely necessitates, every reader to transpose himself or herself into the central position, and become the living fountain, actor, experiencer, himself or herself, of every page, every aspiration, every line."[2]

In his *By Blue Ontario's Shore* he drives the point home in his usual, bluff, fashion:

I swear I begin to see the meaning of these things.
It is not the earth, it is not America, who is so great.
It is I who am great or to be great. It is You up there, or anyone.
It is to walk rapidly through civilisations, governments, theories,
Through poems, pageants, shows, to form individuals.

Underneath all, individuals.
I swear nothing is good to me now that ignores individuals.
The American compact is altogether with individuals.
The only government is that which makes minute of individuals.
The whole theory of the universe is directed unerringly to one single individual—namely to You.

And thus he descants in his *Song of the Rolling Earth*:

Whoever you are! motion and reflection are especially for you.
The divine ship sails the divine sea for you
Whoever you are! you are he or she for whom the earth is solid and liquid,
You are he or she for whom the sun and moon hang in the sky.
For none more than you is immortality.

Each man to himself and each woman to herself, is the word of the past and the present and the true word of immortality.
No one can acquire for another—not one.
No one can grow for another—not one.

[1] Pub. 1855. [2] Quoted in Art. *Whitman* in *Encycl. Britannica.*

The song is to the singer, and comes back most to him.
The teaching is to the teacher, and comes back most to him.
The murder is to the murderer, and comes back most to him.
The theft is to the thief, and comes back most to him.
The gift is to the giver, and comes back most to him—it cannot fail.
The oration is to the orator, the acting is to the actor and actress, not to the audience.
And no man understands, any greatness or goodness but his own, or the indication of his own.

(iii) *The Bible.*

What of the individual in the Bible?

The study of what is told us in the Bible of the relation of the individual to God brings the view that the Bible takes of the individual clearly before us.

There are two lines of development. They run like strands of one thread. At one time the one strand, at another time the other strand, shows itself the more prominent.

The one strand is the revelation of the *majesty of God.* It is hard to say in whom that shows itself more strongly, in an Elijah of the early days, or in the Jews of the later days, after the Canon of the Old Testament had been closed. And between these earlier and later times we find the question put by the Evangelic Prophet of the Exile: "Who hath meted out the spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him? . . . Behold the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance. The inhabitants of the earth are as grasshoppers. He bringeth princes to nothing; he maketh the judges of the earth as vanity."[1]

The other strand is the revelation of *affinity to God.* We find the idea accepted that is found elsewhere, that the king is God's son. Later we find men as men declared to be sons. In the first chapter of Genesis it is the individual, be it male or female, that is created by God in no less than his image and after his likeness. We read "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." And in the second and third chapters we find God conceived as possessing individual

[1] Isa. xl. 13 (margin), xv. 22, 23.

form and acts, fashioning out of the ground, breathing into the clay, walking in the garden where the first pair are and speaking to them as if he were a man. So the account in the previous chapter of the individuality of what God fashioned in his image need not surprise us. And we have in the revelation of Jesus in St. John 'a man,' who is 'heard, seen, with the eyes and with the hands handled,' declared to be the Word that was with God and was God, and shown to us proclaiming in the temple against the protests of those who brought against him his individual manhood, 'I and the Father are One.'

(*b*) *The Universality of the Self.*

A second characteristic our experts find in the Self is Universality. This wonderful Self, contained in itself, finds itself in all things.

Yājnavalkya we have found declaring to certain inquirers: "He who breathes with your breathing is this Self of yours which is in all things."[1] And to Maitreyī: "This priesthood, this knighthood, these worlds, these gods, these beings, everything here, is what the Self is."[2]

And we have seen Aśva-pati place his hand across his forehead and have heard him say: "He who reverences the Self that is in all men as of the size of a span, measured upon one's self [or 'by thinking about one's self'], he it is who eats food in *all* worlds, in *all* beings, in *all* selves."[3]

Our Poet of the Far West, after his manner and in his very different circumstances from those of our Āryan sages, also insists, as we already have noticed, upon the range, far as he can think, of the self in his bosom.

Thus he exclaims in the *Song of Myself*, another of the songs in his *Leaves of Grass*:

> I celebrate myself, and sing myself,
> And what I assume you shall assume,
> For every atom belonging to me as good belongs to you.
>
> . . .
>
> What is commonest, cheapest, nearest, easiest, is Me,
> Me going in for my chances, spending for vast returns.

[1] BAU. 3.4 and 5.
[2] *Id.*, 2.4.6 (p. 133).
[3] CU. 5.18.1. (p. 245).

I am of old and young, of the foolish as much as the wise,
Regardless of others, ever regardful of others,
Maternal as well as paternal, a child as well as a man.

. . .

Of every hue and caste am I, of every rank and religion.

He includes in himself even the rocks and vegetation:

I find I incorporate gneiss, coal, long-threaded moss,
fruits, grains, esculent roots;

And the rain:

Do you guess I have some intricate purpose?
Well I have, for the Fourth-month showers have.

He is integral also with the sea:

You sea! I resign myself to you also—I guess what you mean.
I behold from the beach your crooked inviting fingers.
I believe you refuse to go back without feeling of me.
We must have a turn together. . . .
Cushion me soft, rock me in billowy drowse. . . .
Sea of stretch'd ground swells,
Sea breathing broad and convulsive breaths. . . .
Howler and scooper of storms, capricious and dainty sea,
I am integral with you, I too am of one phase and of all phases.

Still wider he feels himself to be:

My ties and ballasts leave me, my elbows rest in sea-gaps;
I skirt sierras, my palms cover continents;
I am afoot with my vision.

(c) *Mutuality of the Self.*

What of the third feature, Mutuality, which we said our experts would report as being present in the Self?

To that we find our Eastern Fathers making an approach, but only an approach. We are told indeed that the Self is 'made of everything,'[1] from it 'whatever is' has come,[2] and in everything it is the inner thread, yet we find that the Self in Śāṇḍilya's Creed is unconcerned and in Yājnavalkya's teaching is **alipta** (unattaching and unattached), Yājnavalkya adding that, so thorough is the unattachment, the Self is unconcerned and unmoved whether an act be good or evil. There is here accordingly no mutuality, but a merely-artificial connection, such as we noticed was held by the Christian

[1] BAU. 4.4.5., p.126. [2] BAU. 4.5.11, p. 134.

gnostic Valentinus with regard to the spiritual and psychic in the Word become flesh. In the teaching of our Forest Fathers all things are in the Self and the Self is in all things, but when that is said, all is said. The Self is thoroughly indifferent to that to which it gives being and in which it is the uniting and moving power. No sociability is here in the Self, far less mutuality, sociability's strongest form.

One would have expected it otherwise from the sages' announcement of 'That art thou' to each pupil.

No doubt the chief reason for this attribution of thorough unconcernedness and unattachment is to preserve the Self in its undisturbed and true majesty.

Yet such teaching, at any rate, meant the refusal to admit anything like Mutuality, any feeling of concern or care between the One, the Great Self from Whom all proceeds and which is present in everything, and the Other in which it is present.

It is to such as our Poet of the Far West that we have to turn, would we realise the social nature of the Self. His verses are made up of declaring it.

This from his *Song of Myself*:

> I do not ask who you are. That is not important to me.
> You can do nothing and be nothing but what I will infold you.
> To the cotton-field drudge . . . I lean;
> On his right cheek I put the family kiss.
> To anyone dying, thither I speed. . . .
> I seize the descending man and raise him with resistless will.
> O despairer, here is my neck.
> By God, you shall not go down! Hang your whole weight upon me.

And thus he describes himself as the hounded slave:

> I am the hounded slave. I wince at the bite of the dogs.
> Hell and despair are upon me. . . . I clutch the rails of the fence.
> I fall on the weeds and stones. . . .
> The riders spur their unwilling horses . . . and beat me
> Violently over the head with whip-stocks.

Or as the wounded:

> Agonies are one of my changes of garments;
> I do not ask the wounded person how he feels, I myself become the wounded person.

His self is also one with the animals. He gives us not only the negro driving the long drag with its four horses and exclaims:

> I behold the picturesque giant and love him

but he adds:

> I do not stop there:
> I go with the team also.
> Oxen that rattle the yoke and chain or halt in the leafy shade,
> What is it that you express in your eyes?
> It seems to me more than all the print I have read in my life.

Then this of the birds, at the sight of the wood-drake and the wood-duck rising at his step and circling round before him in the air:

> I believe in those wing'd purposes,
> And acknowledge red, yellow, and white, playing within me,

and further:

> The brood of the turkey-hen and she with her half-spread wings,
> I see in them and myself the same old law.

Yet with all this seeing of one's Self shown forth in others, even as the lower life, even (as we saw in our quotations lately) as the very mica in the rock, there is no absorption of the Other. Nay, the Other is more truly itself. The Self and the Other are both in the Self. Here is the high water mark of sociability. It rises to mutuality.

Thus, in his *Birds of Passage*, the poet sings his song *To You:*

> Whoever you are, I fear you are walking the walks of dreams. . . .
> Your true body and soul appear before me.
> Whoever you are, now I place my hand upon you, that you be my poem.
> I will leave all and come and make hymns of you.
> None has understood you, but I understand you.
> None but would subordinate you. I only am he who will never consent to subordinate you.

The words of his we quoted, when we had the individuality of the self brought before us, taken from his *Song of the Rolling Earth*, will come to our memory:

> Whoever you are! motion and reflection are especially for you.

The divine ship sails the divine sea for you.
Each man to himself and each woman to herself. . . .
No one can acquire for another, not one.
No one can grow for another, not one.

And thus in the *Song of Myself* he plainly declares Mutuality as the law of the Self:

I believe in you, my soul. The other I am must not abase itself to you;
And you must not be abased to the other.[1]

(*d*) *The Sinfulness of the Self.*

But the qualities we said would be announced by our experts as features of the Self as they examined these upper depths are not yet fully told. We have had individuality universality and mutuality brought before us. But we added a fourth quality on which we expected information, namely, sinfulness. These are the disturbed portion of the waters, the cause of the disturbance being sin.

We saw that our Forest Fathers maintain that the Self does not attach itself to anything and therefore is '**alipta**' unsmeared: and yet they admit it does declare 'I did wrong. I did right':[2] and we mark their stern discipline of the body, their plain abhorrence of evil deeds, their flight from acquisitive ceremonies, their determination to know nothing but the One Self in all things, as proofs that they were conscious of the smearing of the Self after all, and admitted the decadent quality we now have before us.

But it is to our poet of the seething millions across the Atlantic, the 'free-companion,'[3] who, as we have seen, identified himself with humanity and the material world so widely and deeply, that we find a truer appreciation of the sinfulness of sin. We shall find the cause not only in that wide acquaintance, but still more in the greater sensitiveness to sin that one would perforce possess who had been brought up in a community among whom the Bible was the chief of books, and who tells us that he went thoroughly through the Old and New Testaments, with the perusal of other literature, when he undertook the foundation reading for his poetry.[4]

[1] § 5 of the *Song of Myself*.
[2] BAU. 4.4, 22.d.e.
[3] § 33 of the *Song of Myself*.
[4] See *A Backward Glance o'er Travel'd Roads*, p. 441.

This is his apostrophe to his fellows in his *Song of the Open Road*:

> Whoever you are, come forth! or man or woman come forth
> Out of the dark confinement! out from behind the screen!
> It is useless to protest. I know all and expose it.
> Behold through you as bad as the rest,
> Through the laughter, dancing, dining, supping, of people,
> Inside of dresses and ornaments, inside of those wash'd and trimm'd faces,
> Behold a secret silent loathing and despair.

And here is the self that comes for the poet from behind the screen of the dresses and trimm'd faces and dancing and supping:

> No husband, no wife, no friend, trusted to hear the confession.
> Another self, a duplicate of everyone, skulking and hiding it goes,
> Formless and wordless through the streets of the cities, polite and bland in the parlors,
> In the cars of railroads, in steamboats, in the public assembly,
> Home to the houses.
> Smartly attired, countenance smiling, form upright, death under the breast-bones, hell under the skull-bones,
> Under the broadcloth and gloves, under the ribbon and artificial flowers;
> Keeping fair with the customs; speaking not a syllable of itself,
> Speaking of anything else but never of itself.[1]

Yet no report of the extent and depth of sin in humanity, its horror, and its terrible origin is so strong as that of the Bible.

Jeremiah says: "The heart is deceitful above all things and is desperately sick: who can know it."[2] And this our Lord's indictment: "Out of the heart of men evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishmess."[3] St. John including, as he writes, himself with his Christian readers for whom he requires sinlessness as the true fruit of their Christian birth: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and

[1] From the *Song of the Open Road*, §13.
[2] Jer. xvii. 9. [3] Mark vii. 21, 22.

the truth is not in us";[1] and this also: "The whole world lieth in the evil one."[2]

Yet more. Our Lord presents the good and evil in men's lives as the result of differences of *nature*. Thus he speaks with regard to false prophets in the Sermon on the Mount: "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but the corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them."[3]

And deepset indeed in the spiritual world is this different nature. The Lord, explaining his parable of the Wheat and the Tares, declares that the good seed that produces the Wheat is sown by the Son of Man, that the evil seed that produces the Tares is sown by the Devil; and of that good seed he says, "These are the sons of the kingdom," and of the tares, "These are the sons of the Evil One."[4] And St. John writes: "He that doeth sin is of the Devil. . . . Whosoever is begotten of God cannot sin. . . . In this the children of God are manifest and the children of the Devil."[5]

2. The Lower Depths: The Truth of the Self at last Reached.

We have supposed as yet that our experts' testing apparatus has only reached as far as the upper depths of the ocean of humanity, and these upper waters we discovered to be affected throughout by a wild storm that made the waters heave and break into foam, causing in fact a mighty disturbance. The storm is sin. And we have discovered that the Bible maintains that here is not simply disturbance but radical alteration, so that where there is sinfulness there is a new, a decadent, nature; and such a change of nature that, while man in his origin is the child of God, here he is the child of the Devil.

(*a*) *A Deeper Testing.*

But now we ask our experts to take longer lines. We will have them tell us regarding the depths undisturbed,

[1] 1 John i. 8.
[2] *Id.*, v. 19.
[3] Matt. v. 16–20.
[4] Matt. xiii. 37–39.
[5] 1 John iii. 8–10.

where, beneath the tumult, the ocean moves in its true placid strength.

To put our parable into fact. We wish to listen to what the teachers we have taken may have to tell us regarding humanity in its perfection; or, rather indeed, whether they will tell us that there is such a humanity: for it takes a strong faith to believe that there is such.

(*b*) *The Desire for Perfection.*

Not that we do not desire perfection. Perfect each of us would be. We know that sin is contrary to us, unmans us, makes us unfit to stand before God. It ruins our temporal good. It uproots us from the eternal. Of all that our experience and our conscience assure us.

(*c*) *The Necessity of Perfection for Existence.*

Indeed, when we think over the matter, we discover that the mere fact of existence means perfection. Each thing must be what it is or it would not be. Man must be man. This fretworn, distracted creature we are so intimately aware of cannot be the true creature, but only his miserable counterfeit.

To put the argument theologically: God made nothing imperfect. Be anything imperfect, it can only last temporarily. It must recover itself or perish. For only that which is accepted by the Creator can remain before him.

Consequently our difficulty is not to imagine perfection existing, but to imagine that sinful men should exist. The mystery is explained by the fact that men are not automata but endowed by God with free-will, and with that free-will have acted and continue to act against God to their own undoing, under the will of God, who by this means and with many warnings puts their manhood to test.

(*d*) *The Cognizance of the Lower Depth.*

We listen then eagerly to the reports of our experts as to the essential Perfection of the Self.

(i) *By the Upanishad Fathers.*

We find in the quaint Brāhmaṇic account in the Aitareya Upanishad of the Creator bringing to the cosmic powers

(fire, wind, death, the waters, etc.) first a bull and then a horse, in vain as an acceptable dwelling-place in which they may find their respective abodes. But, when he leads up to them the Person (**puruṣa**) [that is, the Person as such, in human form], the cosmic powers exclaim 'Well made!' and the sage who tells the story adds: 'Verily, the Person [as such, in human form] is a thing well made.'[1]

We have heard Śāṇḍilya describe the nobility of the Person, declaring that his form was light, his conception truth, his body (**ātmā**) the limitless space overhead (**ākāśa**).[2]

Uddālaka also at the close of his Parable of the Ordeal through which the truth-speaker passes safely exclaims: "This whole world has truth as its soul. That is Reality. That is the Self. That art thou, O Śvetaketu"?[3]

And Yājnavalkya, speaking of the Self that is among the senses, the light in the heart,[4] says: "This is the great unborn Self who eats the food everyone eats, the giver of good. He finds good who knows this."[5]

(ii) *By the Poet of the New Democracy.*

Next we turn to our bluff poet of the New Democracy, and we find in his *Song Universal*, contained in the series he entitles *Birds of Passage*, exactly and verbally perfection proclaimed.

> In this broad earth of ours,
> Amid the measureless grossness and slag,
> Enclosed safe within its central heart,
> Nestles the seed perfection.
> By every life a share or more or less,
> None born but it is born. Concealed or unconcealed the seed is waiting.

And this we have from his poem *To You*:

> Painters have painted their swarming groups and the centre-figure of all,
> From the head of the centre-figure spreading a nimbus of gold-color'd light;
> But I paint myriads of heads, but paint no head without its nimbus of gold-color'd light.
> O I could sing such grandeurs and glories about you!
> You have not known what you are. You have slumber'd upon yourself all your life.

[1] Aitareya, 2.2. [2] CU. 3.14. [3] *Id.*, 6.16.3.
[4] BAU. 4.3.7. [5] *Id.*, 4.4.24.

The mockeries are not you;
Underneath them and within them I see you lurk.
Whoever you are, claim your own,
Master or mistress in your own right over Nature, elements, pain, passion, dissolution.
Through angers, losses, ambition, ignorance, ennui, what you are picks its way.

(iii) *By the Irish Poet Æ.*

We turn to another poet, who, in his green, carefully cultivated, well-populated, island of old romance, close to Britain, its inhabitatnts romantically-minded still, gives us his glittering word-pictures that show a deeper absorption of the New Testament than do the broadly-coloured long-extended pageants of the Poet of the great metropolis of the new million-fold nation across the Atlantic, Æ, or, to give him his name, George William Russell. Here is how he describes the King who is so feebly apprehended, and is yet our true self, the Man not yet self-perverted, but as he came from God's hands, God's archetype of man in the individual.

We will notice he entitles his poem *Krishna.* It was long before the Krishna cult began that our Upanishad sages taught their doctrine, but their doctrine is found (as where not in Hindu religious thought?) in that cult. So under the name Krishna hides the 'Unitive Self' of the Forest Fathers, and our Irish poet has here taken over the Name for the 'Perfect Self' of the Christian Faith.

KRISHNA.

I paused beside the cabin door and saw the King of Kings at play. . . .
The mother laughed upon the child made gay by its ecstatic morn;
And yet the sages spake of It as the Ancient and Unborn.
I saw him pass from love to love; and yet the pure allowed His claim
To be the purest of the pure.
I saw the open tavern door flash on the dusk and ruddy glare
And saw the King of Kings, outcast, reel brawling through the starlit air;
And yet he is the Prince of Peace of whom the ancient wisdom tells.
I saw the King of Kings again . . . a form so darkened and so marred;

And yet He is the Light of Lights whose blossoming is Paradise.
I saw the King of Kings again, a miser with a heart grown cold;
And yet he is the Prodigal, the Spendthrift of the Heavenly Gold,
The largesse of whose glory crowns the blazing brows of cherubim,
And sun and moon and stars and flowers are jewels scattered forth by Him.
I saw the King of Kings descend the narrow doorway to the dust;
And yet He is the life within the Ever-living Living One,
The fiery fountain of the stars, and He the golden urn where all
The glittering spray of planets in their myriad beauty fall.[1]

And thus the same poet sings of the presence of the King in the multitudes that throng the City of the poet's residence.

UNDER THE TWILIGHT.

. . . The stars appear
O'er the prodigious, smouldering, dusky, city flare.
. . . I know there lies
Open somewhere this hour a gate to Paradise. . . .
Or am I there already, and is it Paradise
To look on mortal things with an immortal's eyes? . . .
Mine eyes beget new majesties: my spirit greets
The trams, the high-built glittering galleons of the streets
That float through twilight rivers from gallaxies of light.
Nay, in the Fount of Days they rise, they take their flight,
And wend to the great deep, the Holy Sepulchre.
Those dark misshapen folk, to be made lovely there,
Hurry with me, not all ignoble as we seem.
The earth melts in my blood. The air that I inhale
Is like enchanted wine poured from the Holy Grail.
What glimmer was it then? Was it the flash of wings
As through the blinded mart rode on the King of Kings?
O stay, departing glory, stay with us but a day,
And burning seraphim shall leap from out our clay.

THE NIGHT SHUTS OUT THE TWILIGHT.

. . . The night draws down.
Exiled from light, forlorn, I walk in Dublin Town.

[1] *The Oxford Book of English Mystical Verse*, p. 498–.

Yet, had I might to lift the veil, the will to dare,
The fiery rushing chariots of the Lord are there,
The whirlwind path, the blazing gates, the trumpets blown,
The halls of heaven, the majesty of throne by throne.[1]

(iv) *The Bible.*

Thus the Upanishad Fathers and these two English poets. Yet how much more thoroughly is perfection proclaimed and required for man in the Bible!

On what is the very first page of the Old Testament as the Jews have handed it down to us we are told that God made man in His own image and after His likeness. There is perfection indeed.

Nor do the Scriptures suffer us to let the perfection of the person be simply a 'waiting seed, concealed, or unconcealed,' which is as much as Walt Whitman will grant. In the Bible the flower of the seed is required.

In Deuteronomy the command is given to the people: "Thou shalt be perfect with the LORD thy God."[2] In what is known as the Priests' Code, Noah is declared by the prophet to be 'perfect,'[3] and the LORD declares to Abram, "Walk before me and be thou perfect."[4] The LORD bids Moses say to all the congregation of the people at Sinai: "Ye shall be holy for I the LORD your God am holy."[5] In the Psalms 'the perfect man' is the man set forward for everyone to strive after and it is so also in the New Testament. Our Blessed Lord commands his disciples, "Ye shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."[6] St. Paul prays with regard to the Thessalonian Christians "that the God of peace himself may may sanctify them wholly, and that their spirit, soul, and body be preserved entire, without blame, in the presence[7] of our Lord Jesus Christ."[8] The Roman Christians he speaks of as having 'died to sin,' and asks how they can 'live any longer therein.'[9] St. John in his Epistle, while he says that "those who say they have no sin deceive themselves and the truth is not in them,"[10] yet states as an axiom that "whosoever is begotten of God cannot sin"[11]; and in his Gospel Jesus tells Nicodemus

[1] *The Oxford Book of English Mystical Verse*, p. 496–. [2] Deut. xviii. 13.
[3] Gen. vi. 9. [4] *Id.*, xvii. 1. [5] Lev. xix. 2. [6] Matt. v. 48.
[7] 'presence,' RV. margin. Gk. 'in the presence' (**parousia**, lit., 'a being near').
[8] 1 Thess. v. 23. [9] Rom. vi. 2. [10] 1 John i. 8. [11] 1 John iii. 9.

that until a man is begotten from above he cannot see or enter the Kingdom of God.[1]

XI. JESUS IS GIVEN BY GOD AS THE PERFECT SELF.

So then we have had our experts acquaint us with their discoveries regarding the Self: the Upanishad Fathers, the Poet of the Far West, and the Poet of the Emerald Isle, and, expert of experts, our wonderful Holy Scriptures. They have told us the qualities of the upper depths. They have let down their testing line also into the deeper, the foundation, waters, the waters undisturbed by the storms playing on the surface, to which the upper waters, alas very far down, have yielded; and have become, by the yielding, so much affected.

We have noticed that it is in these lower depths that the ocean is revealed in its genuine character; that, to change from parable to fact, in the depth of our heart, in the innermost of each of us, is the man as he ought to be, the man unchanged by the Evil, the Perfect Son, the true Self, the image and likeness of God as it came fresh from God's hands, unsullied, of which the Book of Genesis tells us, 'the archetype' (as Dr. Westcott calls it). But has the archetype ever been, or is it ever to be, brought to expression? Is the actuality possible? Must not the tempest of sin always triumph, or rather, must not the will of man always give way to it, and so the man archetypal be only an aspiration, a mirage of refreshment and beauty that lures the traveller to find that the beauty and greenery have vanished and that round him, thirsty and hungry, is only an arid waste; to find, that is to say, in man's perfection only a dream, a deduction of certain theologians, a fancy only—for the rapture of certain mystical poets?

The answer of Christianity to that question is that the Perfect Man is no dream. Man as he ought to be *has* been sent from on high. The Perfect Son obeying completely his Father's Will and unaltered by Sin has been seen, and heard, and with the hands handled.

[1] John iii. 3, 5.

Let us then with reverence and wonder contemplate him. Here is the Perfect Self before us. Here is 'the light that lighteth every man,' St. John tells us.[1] "The head of every man," St. Paul tells us, "is Christ."[2] We shall accordingly expect to find in Christ the qualities our experts have reported as belonging to the Self, individuality, universality, mutuality, and such other qualities as there may be that have not been reported as yet. Only we shall expect to find all qualities here in their true purity and intensity. We shall miss the feature that so despoiled the upper waters, making them broken and striated, namely sinfulness. The full strong humanity of sinlessness and perfect righteousness, so far down in the depth of the flood, will here have risen to the surface and will be flowing strong, unbroken and free. Instead of sin we shall find perfection at last. Not that He who is revealed as the Perfect One was not tempted. We are told that he was 'in all points tempted like as we are.'[3] But here, if we may continue our simile of the ocean, the tempest might play on the surface and perhaps ruffle and chill (we remember the distress in the Garden and the cry on the Cross), but it never broke the strong flow of the tide. He is given to us as the One in whom was no sin.

To guide us in our humble review of his glory let us listen to him as he speaks of himself to his disciples in the Gospel according to St. John in the Parable of the Vine: "I am the true Vine.[4] My Father is the husbandman. Ye are the branches."[5]

With the true Vine before us let us inquire as to these qualities our experts have found in the Self. We shall find that our expectation of their presence will not fail us. Let us take them in the order we have already adopted: Individuality, universality, mutuality, perfection. We shall find ourselves adding thereto. Where indeed may those who survey the Perfect Self stop short in their survey?

[1] John i. 9. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 3. [3] Heb. iv. 15.

[4] In his *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, Dr. Adolph Schlatter quotes, with regard to this Parable, Jerem. ii. 21, and Ps. lxxx. 9, and adds: "Accordingly the vine is 'true' when it actually bears fruit. Israel, it is implied, is not the true vine, because it does not bear fruit unto God." We at once think of the wild grapes of Is. v. 2, and the Barren Fig Tree of Matt. xxi. 19.

[5] John xv. 1–8.

(*a*) The First Feature: Individuality.

Jesus then is before us in the Scriptures, first, as an individual. He moved as 'a man' among men, was heard by the multitude, and wrought among them wonderful works, making his self-hood known by his very present announcement in our Parable: "*I* am the true Vine."

We need hardly remind ourselves that it is the Self in the proper and only true meaning of the term, that is here before us, as it is before us all through, as we peruse our Upanishads, our mystic Poets, or, as here, our Holy Scripture, the self limitless, contained in itself, that resides in the mortal body (conceived to be so residing on account of our thinking in terms of space-time), but does not belong to the order of mortality. We recognise at once that that is the case here, in this passage of St. John's Gospel now before us, when we observe the Lord's injunction, that his disciples are to abide *in* him as the branches abide in the Vine. Dr. Adolph Schlatter in his comment on the passage brings out well the contrast between '*with* him' and '*in* him.' He points out that in comradeship with their teacher the disciples had been till then *with* their Lord. There we have what we may call the *material* self. Now Jesus declares in view of his death anticipated to be so near, that a spiritual fellowship, a being *in* him, is to be their relation to him in the future. Not that we are to deem that the approaching death was necessary for that mode of relationship. Already in the Gospel has Jesus spoken of himself as 'bread to be eaten.'[1] It is the spiritual 'taking in,' the spiritual indwelling, that is the true relation always between the teacher and those whom he teaches, be the teacher and the taught present with each other in the body or not. And Jesus is given to us as the limitless Self living in the flesh the perfect life. That is the marvel of the revelation of Jesus.

(*b*) The Second Feature: Universality.

'The Vine!' Does it seem to us a narrowing emblem? It means the Church of God, those whom God has chosen and called out. So to Isaiah the Lord spoke of Israel, his Elect Nation, as his 'Vineyard' and 'pleasant plant';[2] and

[1] John vi. 32, 35, 51, 63.
[2] Isa. v. 1–7.

the Psalmist sung of Israel brought out of bondage by the Nile as 'the Vine out of Egypt.'[1] The emblem had then indeed a narrow significance. It meant one Nation only which was chosen out of all others. But with Jesus it has gained *Universality*. Here is nothing short of a new humanity. Here, St. Paul tells us, is the Second Adam. He bids the Colossians "mortify their members that are upon the earth," for in putting on Christ they have "put on the New Man, which is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him, where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Sythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all and in all."[2] Here, in brief, is, as Westcott expresses it, "One" in whom *all* men are "to find their fragmentary being capable of reconciliation."

Universality indeed! Behold the proclamations of Scripture regarding the One Perfect Life! View the prospect that rises before us when we meet such a passage as this from the Colossians: "In Him, the Son of God's love, the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him and unto him; and he is before all things and in him all things consist."[3] Yea, nothing is to be from the Vine, the Body of Christ, excluded. If now, with the Epistle to the Hebrews, "we see not yet all things subjected to him,"[4] we are told, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that the Church which is his body is the fulness of Him "who is reaching his fulness through all things in all."[5]

(*c*) The Third Feature: Mutuality.

Further, as we listen to Jesus in the Parable of the Vine in which he proclaims himself to his own, we hear him describing a complex of personality involving a mutuality between him and his own.

We note that, in contradistinction to plants that show a great stem from which the branches spring, the vines,

[1] Ps. lxxx. [2] Col. iii. 5, 10, 11.
[3] *Id.*, i. 13–18. [4] Heb. ii. 8.
[5] Eph. i. 23. (Westcott's translation in his *Commentary on the Ephesians*.)

climbing by tendrils or adventitious roots, may be said to be composed entirely of branches. Again, as to fruit, with most fruit-trees the mass of the tree, with its trunk branches and foliage, is dominant; the fruit is but a scattering of gleams throughout it. With the vine on the other hand the fruit is dominant. The plant itself, although it has produced the bunches of grapes, presents itself as but a straggling collection of leafy tendrils, the sight of which makes the spectator wonder at the richness of fruit that hangs from it.

The Vine then may be said to be made up of its tendrils. So does the Lord, saying, "I am the Vine, ye are the branches," present himself as *embodied* in His own. The Lord gives up himself that in Him the begotten of God may live. We recollect that this parable is presented just before the Lord's prayer for consecration of himself as a sacrifice that he may draw all men unto himself. We remember how we are told in the Epistle to the Ephesians that Christ "loved the Church and gave himself up for it."[1]

Looking again at the relation of things we see that this giving is mutal. If the Lord on the one hand gives himself up initially to his disciples, the disciples on the other hand give themselves up to him: Christ's life becomes their life.

This living of Christ in the disciple and of the disciple in Christ is indeed, as we know, a principle of the Christian life. How often does St. Paul exhort his fellow Christians to live as the body of Christ and members in particular thereof; to be true to their being in Christ and to Christ being in them. "Christ in you," he tells the Colossians, is "the hope of glory."[2]

It is in the Self the mutuality is centred. The glorious Lord gives himself. Admission into his body is by the personal disposition of repentance and faith, through which each believer at his baptism puts on the New Man. The apostle accordingly thus describes what his acceptance of Christ has involved: "I have been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I that live, but Christ lives in me, and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me."[3]

[1] Eph. v. 25. [2] Col. i. 27. [3] Gal. ii. 20 (margin).

In the Gospel according to St. John, earlier than where the Parable of the Vine is brought before us, Jesus to the hungry multitude who listen to him in the wilderness after he has satisfied them with material food, announces himself as (better than even the manna which came out of heaven of which their fathers did eat but did die) the bread of life which came out of heaven that a man might eat thereof, and not die, but live for ever, which Bread was his flesh which he would give for the life of the world.[1]

We are to notice that this giving up of the psychic to the spiritual is the life of the self. For the psychic must eventually die. That is the lesson, according to its light and as we have interpreted it[2], of the Second Brāhmaṇa of the Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest, which we give as our Second Selection. We shall remember how in St. John's Gospel, when Jesus, present among the Jews from whom he had already won converts, was told that certain Greeks (representative of the great world outside Jewry) were desirous to see him, he cried to the multitude with reference to his approaching death: "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified. Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abides by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit. He that holds his life (*psychē*) dear is destroying it, but he that makes his life of no account in this world[3] shall keep it unto life (*zoē*) eternal. . . . I, if I be lifted up out of[4] the earth will draw all men unto myself."[5] And how often does Jesus in the Synoptic gospels also declare the same lesson, as, for example, in these words: "Whosoever willeth to save his soul (*psychē*) shall lose it, but whosoever will lose his soul for my sake and the gospel's shall find it."[6]

(*d*) The Fourth Feature: Perfection.

But more! As we gaze on Jesus we see, as we have already noted, a feature, influencing all that we are told of him, that was not discovered in the upper depths by our surveyors of humanity. In these upper depths the waters were wind-tossed and broken by sin. The true nature of humanity was therefore in that upper region not easy to

[1] John vi. 48–51. [2] P. 247. [3] 'world,' *kosmos*. [4] 'out of,' *ek*.
[5] John xii. 20–25. "He that holds . . . in this world" is the translation in R. F. Weymouth's *New Testament in English Speech*.
[6] Mark viii. 35.

discover. In fact the disturbance was a proof, as we have learned, of another nature having set in.[1] Only by a long paying-out of the line, so that its recording instrument reached below the far-down extending tumult could the waters in their purity, man in his proper condition, be discovered, the man that ought to be, which is 'the waiting seed, concealed or unconcealed, of Perfection' of our Far-Western's poet's verses, our Near-Western poet's hidden 'King.' But now we see it actual in Jesus, the true Vine, the One Perfect Life, in whom all who are begotten of God must abide would they fulfil their birth.

So, in Jesus, as he is given to us, is perfection no dream, but actual. Here at last is man as God made him, and as the Scriptures require, the Man Perfect.

The word used for 'perfect' in the Hebrew of the Old Testament is *tāmīm*, which our lexicon tells us means 'sound, wholesome, unimpaired, innocent, having integrity.'[2] In the Greek of the New Testament the word is *teleios*, which means 'brought to its end (*telos*), wanting nothing to completeness, perfect.'[3]

And now it is for us to notice, as we look upon Jesus, what manner of perfection the Lord enjoins.

First we notice the height he requires. In Deuteronomy Moses says to Israel, "Thou shalt be perfect *with* the Lord thy God." Jesus, addressing his disciples, raises the perfection thus required of them of old time to the highest height: "Ye shall be perfect *as* your heavenly Father is perfect."[4]

Next, when we inquire as to the quality of the perfection we find that, as a prelude to the injunction we have just quoted, the Lord has been bidding his disciples to live thus: "Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you that ye may become sons of your Father which is in heaven for he makes his sun to rise on the evil and the good and sends rain on the just and the unjust."[5]

[1] P. 30.

[2] Brown Driver and Briggs's *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.*

[3] Grimm's *Lexicon of the New Testament,* revised by J. H. Thayer.

[4] Matt. v. 48. R. F. Weymouth in his *New Testament in Modern Speech* gives the meaning thus: "You, however, are to be complete in goodness as your heavenly Father is complete."

[5] Matt. v. 44, 45.

And we have further light on the quality of the perfection afforded by what the Lord requires of the rich young man who came to him, saying, "Good teacher, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life." Being asked as to his knowledge of the commandments, the young man replied: "Teacher, all these things have I observed from my youth." Then did the Lord say, "One thing thou lackest (or, in St. Matthew, 'If thou willest to be perfect'); go, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shall have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me."[1]

It is to be noticed also that, when explaining the Parable he had given of the Sower, Jesus tells his disciples that it is those who are "choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life," that, although they are the good seed sown by the Son of Man, "bring forth no fruit to perfection."[2]

But it is the sinlessness of the Lord's perfection, perhaps, most awakens our wonder. St. Paul writes of Christ to the Corinthians as one who 'knew no sin.'[3] In the First Epistle of St. Peter we are told that "Christ who suffered for us, did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; when he was reviled, reviled not again."[4] In the Gospel of the Evangelist who so insists upon Jesus' coming in the flesh, the Lord says to the Jews, "which of you convicteth me of sin?"[5] The same evangelist in the First Epistle declares "in him is no sin."[6] In the Epistle to the Hebrews we are told that, although he was "in all points tempted like as we are," he was "yet without sin."[7]

All that declared of one who had been 'a man'! And so—let us notice—no less required of all men! The Lord in the Old Testament commands Israel to be holy as he is holy. We realise as we read the Psalms that no sin may be found in the man whom God would accept. St. Paul insists again and again that the putting on of Christ means a death unto sin.[8] St. John, in the First Epistle, tells his readers that, although if they say they have no sin they deceive themselves and the truth is not in them.[9] Yet he declares later, "whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, cannot sin, for God's seed is in him."[10] And that quality of

[1] Mark x. 17–22; Luke xviii. 18–33; Matt. xix. 16–22.
[2] Luke viii. 14. [3] 2 Cor. v. 21. [4] 1 Pet. ii. 21–23.
[5] John viii. 46. [6] 1 John iii. 5. [7] Heb. iv. 15.
[8] Rom. vi. 1–7. [9] 1 John i. 8. [10] *Id.*, iii. 9.

the Perfect Son, seemingly so unattainable, the author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, who closely studied the Scriptures in this respect, accepts as not only plainly required and plainly bestowed, but also absolutely necessary for man's salvation. He makes Faithful tell Hope; that "unless he could obtain the righteousness of a man that never had sinned, neither his own, nor all the righteousness of the world, could save him."

To all this our conscience bears witness. We know in our hearts that no man that sins can stand before God.

As another feature of the Lord's perfection, we may observe also his perfect harmony with the heavenly Father. In St. John Jesus declares to the Jews: "As I hear, I judge."[1] "Verily, verily, I say unto you the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing; for what things soever he doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner."[2] So close is the harmony that later on in the Gospel Jesus declares: "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do them, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know and understand the Father is in me, and I in the Father."[3] To Philip at the Last Supper when he and his own are gathered together, thus he declares: "The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth his works."[4] Here is the root of that dependence on the Father for the works that he did, which we find recorded in the Synoptic Gospels.

What of other features of the Lord's perfection? For where may we stay? Have we not had, in the quotation we presented some time ago to the reader, our theologian, who, by one who was more acquainted than any with his life and work as bishop, was entitled 'the adoring student,' writing this confession?—"We see more of his beauty as our power of vision is disciplined and purified. In his humanity is included whatever belongs to the consummation of the individual and of the race, not only in one stage, but in all stages of progress, and in regard to the whole inheritance of our nature, enlarged by the most vigorous use while the world lasts."[5]

[1] John v. 30. [2] *Id.*, v. 19. [3] *Id.*, x. 37, 38.
[4] *Id.*, xiv. 10. [5] *Gospel of Life*, p. 300.

Two features at least occur to the writer which, if we would have an adequate view, seem to need more attention: the creative and the restorative power which the Scriptures tell us belong to the Son.

(*e*) Creative Power.

First, Creative power. We have indeed already touched upon that, and we might gather the following texts regarding it. The statement in the Prologue of St. John that through the Son as his Word the Father brought all that exists into existence. The statement which the Lord himself makes later on in the Gospel: "My Father worketh even until now, and I work"[1]; and what we are told shortly after: "As the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself."[2] In the Epistle to the Ephesians we shall remember Jesus is declared to be reaching his fulness 'through all things in all.' The Church is in that last passage declared to be his body, and Dr. Westcott, whose translation we have here quoted, explains that the teaching of the passage is that it is by "Christ's bringing by a continuous process all things into living union with himself through the Church," that the End shall be reached,[3] that End, in which St. Paul tells us God shall become at last, through the victories of the Son, 'all in all.'

(*f*) Restorative Power.

Second, Restorative power. The Son is not only the Father's means of creating, but is also, as we have already indicated, the Father's means of bringing back to himself what he has through the Son created. "God so loved the world," we are told in the Gospel according to St. John, that he "sent the Son that the world through him should be saved."[4] We have already quoted Jesus in St. John, declaring himself to be the Bread of Life, of which if a man ate he should have life eternal; "and the bread which I will give," he explains, "is my flesh, for the life of the World."[5] Here is that entire giving up of self which we have already noted and which is the central energy of the

[1] John v. 17. [2] *Id.*, 26.
[3] Westcott on Eph. i. 23, in his *Commentary* on the Epistle.
[4] John iii. 16, 17. [5] John vi. 51.

ministry of salvation that is portrayed both in St. John and in the Synoptic Gospels. No testimony to that overwhelming self-surrender in order that others might be brought into the kingdom of God is stronger than the railing of those who passed by as he hung on the Cross. "Ha! thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, save thyself," with the mocking meanwhile among themselves of the high priests with the scribes: "He saved others, himself he cannot save."[1]

Here then is the *One*, in whom, as the theologian who has given us so much guidance puts it, each of us is to find himself 'capable of reconciliation.'[2] That is our necessity, St. John tells us. "The witness of God concerning his Son," he says in the First Epistle, is this: "That God gave unto us eternal life, and that this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life."[3]

XII. THE TRUE HEIGHT OF MAN.

Let us rest our eyes again upon the height of this Sonship at last revealed in its perfection in Jesus. How stupendous it is, like one of the Himālayan summits! Nay, no earthly height can compare. Have we not heard Jesus proclaim, "I and the Father are one," and noted the Evangelist write in his prologue that the word that became flesh in Jesus was "in the beginning with God and was God"?

Yet there it stands, as a revelation of Man. The learned Church Father, Irenaeus, born about 130 in Asia Minor, became Bishop of Lyons in 177. Shortly after that, he wrote a book which he called *A Refutation of Knowledge Falsely So Called*. It was an exposition of the Divine Economy and the Incarnation, and came to be regarded as a criterion for sound doctrine by later theologians, especially by those of the Greek Church.[4] Taking in his purview the history of mankind, he describes thus, in a sentence quoted in a note by Dr. Westcott,[5] what he believes was the change that came in Jesus: "Not from the beginning were we made gods, but at

[1] Mark xv. 29–31; Matt. xxvii. 39–42; Luke xxiii. 35, 37. [2] P. 234.
[3] 1 John v. 9–12. [4] Art. "Irenaeus" in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, [14].
[5] On p. 319 in Essay on the "Gospel of Creation" in his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John*.

first indeed men, then at length gods."[1] A century or so later, in an Apollinarian treatise, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, we discover this passage, also quoted by Westcott[2]: "The Word of God became man, that we might be deified."[3]

Of this change we may well ask: Is it not here implied that in the 'New Man from heaven' and in those who have 'put him on' a new race of beings has come into existence. Can 'gods'—can 'thė deified'—be said to be 'men' any longer?

Yet that conclusion we know is not the teaching of the Scriptures or of the Church.

St. Paul entitles Christ the second Adam. Adam is the Hebrew word for 'man.'[4] And by the Second Adam, the apostle means Adam (man) as we read of him in the First Chapter of Genesis as the final work of God's creation, man male and female, made in God's image and after his likeness, and set to replenish the earth and subdue it. And he reminds the Colossians that it is a new *man* that they have put on, who is by them to be renewed in knowledge after the image of Him who created him.[5]

With regard to Jesus as he presented himself among men all the Evangelists bring before us a man, and this very St. John who so clearly proclaims the divinity of Jesus makes it, as we have seen, his special mission to insist that he was flesh and that in those who denied that he had come in the flesh the spirit of Anti-Christ was speaking. In the Epistle to the Hebrews we are told that Jesus "not to angels is continually reaching a helping hand, but to the seed of Abraham," and that "for this purpose it was necessary that in all respects He should be made to resemble his brethren."[6]

Indeed, this same Irenaeus from whom we have quoted the statement that with the coming of Jesus men became gods, argues thus upon the necessity that, if mankind was to be rescued, Jesus should have been a man: "If a man had not conquered the adversary of man, the enemy would not have

[1] "Non ab initio Dii facti sumus, sed primo quidem homines, tunc demum Dii," Iren, 4, 38, 4, in the Latin translation, which is apparently the only form in which this part of Irenaeus's book survives; quoted by Westcott in the just-mentioned essay.

[2] *Gospel of Creation*, p. 319.

[3] *De Inc. Verbi*, §51, p. 75.

[4] See note, p. 274.

[5] Col. iii. 10.

[6] Heb. ii. 16, 17. The translation is Dr. Weymouth's in his *New Testament in Modern Speech.*

been justly conquered. And again, if God had not bestowed salvation, we should not have possessed it surely. And if man had not been united to God, he could not have partaken of incorruption. For it was necessary that the Mediator of God and men by His own essential relationship with both should bring both together into friendship and concord, and on the one hand present man to God and on the other make God known to man."[1]

So have we in the Perfect Son a recovery of the archetype, man at last become as God made him, and who, having thus become what the Father has willed he should be, can at last stand as man before Him.

XIII. HOW THE 'WAITING SEED' HAS BEEN BROUGHT TO ITS FLOWER.

Here then is the 'Waiting Seed' of the poet's verses brought to its flower. Here at last in completeness is God's image and after his likeness; 'the First-Born' who was 'brought into the inhabited earth' (as he is called in the Epistle to the Hebrews[2]) in his truth. Here is the Perfect Son, man as he ought to be.

Let us review the Grand History of Man here implied.

(*a*) The True Nature of Man.

At once, on the first page, as we have noted, the Ideal Man and his World come before us in Genesis. Behold God at the beginning, his Spirit moving on the waters of chaos, and calling by his Word the grand succession of created things that finds its climax in Man (Adam[3]), whom God makes in his own image and after his likeness—in this distinguished from all the previous creation—male and female, bidden to replenish the earth and subdue it and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the

[1] Westcott's translation of *Iren.* 3.18.7, on p. 320 of his *Commentary of the Epistles of St. John.*

[2] Heb. i. 6. Gk., RV., margin.

[3] In Brown Driver and Briggs's *Hebrew and English Lexicon to the Old Testament* the Hebrew word 'Adam' is thus defined: *Adam, man, mankind* (1) *a man* (=Ger. *Mensch*)=human being, Gen. ii. 5, 7, etc., etc.; (2) coll. man, mankind; Gen. i. 26, etc., distinctly=men+women; given as a name, Gen. v. 2.

earth. And we are told that when God saw everything that he had made, behold, it was very good.

Further revelation of this is given by St. Paul. Speaking of Jesus as the Man of the First Chapter of Genesis, he describes him as the man 'out of[1] heaven.'[2]

Here accordingly is heaven declared as archetypal Man's original home.

We are told yet again that this Adam is a 'life-giving spirit.'[3]

But more. It had come to be believed for long and widely that the relation of man to God was that of a son to a Father. The 'image and likeness' mentioned in Genesis came accordingly to be accepted as the image and likeness of a son. But the sons had failed to maintain their true birth. Here then is the Son in whom the sonship of all men is restored to its proper perfection.

And what of his Kingdom? As the Man in God's image he has dominion given to him over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and over everything that moveth upon the earth. That dominion is still his, but behold the further revelation of him and of his dominion. Not only is he revealed to be in his nature close to the King over all, whose viceregent he is, as a Son to a Father, but, St. Paul tells the Colossians, "in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him and unto him. He is before all things and in him all things exist."[4]

Thus St. Paul. And we have seen how St. John also proclaims a glorious expansion of what is revealed in Genesis. This image and likeness of God is declared to be the Word of God that was with God and was God at the creation, that through him all that exists has come into existence; that in him was life and the life was the light of men; that he is the light of every man; and, further, that the Word became flesh, and that his glory was beheld as the glory of the only begotten from the Father; and that, standing before men, as a man, in the Temple, the Word become flesh declared, supporting what the Evangelist has already

[1] Greek *ek*. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 47. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 45. [4] Col. i. 13–17.

written in the Prologue as to his divinity: "I and the Father are one."

(*b*) THE ASSAY OF THE ARCHETYPE.

But the archetype had to be tried and is being tried. We would understand that the Father tries everything from electrons to suns, as they speed in their several orbits, from the archangel to the worm; and that it is just in the specific world in which each thing has its unique place and its glory that each thing is tried.

So was it to come to pass that he who (to bring in the further revelation with regard to Creation given to us in St. John's Gospel) was the Word through whom the Father had brought all things into existence, fashioned eventually in the image of God and after God's likeness, and ordained to replenish and subdue the earth made by God through Him as God's Word, and have dominion therein over the fish of the sea and the fowl of the air and every living thing that upon the earth moved, should be made of the earth he was to subdue, and quickened with the life of the flesh over which he was given dominion, that he might rule the earth and the flesh that composed his frame and the earth and the flesh outside it.

The question was, as is the question for everything, one must believe, in God's world: Would the archetype of man, God's Ideal, be true to its nature when set in the actual.

So we have in the Second and Third Chapters of Genesis God's Assay of the Man brought before us in the First Chapter.

In these two chapters the Lord Creator is apparently upon the earth. He fashions man out of the dust of the ground and breathes into his nostrils so that he may become a living soul, *nephesh* in the Hebrew (*psychē* in the Greek translation), that is, endowed with the life of the flesh. *Nephesh* is used of animals as well as of men. It denotes the stream of animal life, constituent of hunger and thirst and appetite, of emotions and passions.[1] Here is what Professor Heinrici tells us Jewish theologians call the 'copy' of the 'original,' that is of the man in the First Chapter.[2] Here is the archetype of man, God's image and after his

[1] For detail see *nephesh* in Appendix III.

[2] C. F. Georg Heinrici on 1 Cor. xv. 45, in Meyer's *Kommentar*, [illegible].

likeness, and so possessing free will, fashioned out of the dust of the ground and having breathed into him *nephesh* (*psychē*), a merely animal life, the life of the flesh.

And what do we find to be the result? The archetype, although possessing free will, has not in this constitution sufficient strength of the Spirit to keep his will constantly obedient to his Maker. So fashioned, he transgresses his Maker's command at the persuasion of the most subtle of the beasts of the field that the LORD God had made. And this departure from loyalty to God meant, we have seen in our study, not simply a decline from the archetype, not just a fracture or stain upon it, but the entrance of a different nature. St. John in the First Epistle, by his statement, "The Devil sinneth from the beginning," shows that he has in mind this evil act exercised at the beginning of things by the enemy of God upon God's handiwork. He forthwith declares, as we have frequently noted, the change of nature. "In this," he says, "the children of God are manifest and the children of the Devil. Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother."[1] Here again, with the words, "he that loveth not his brother," he evidently refers to this narrative in Genesis with its account of Cain's murder of Abel.

Thus a period of education through bitter experience had begun. St. Paul describes it. For a while man was left to realise for himself how weak he was as fashioned in the flesh. These were the times of his ignorance, of which St. Paul speaks to the Athenians.[2] During that time God was patiently waiting and watching.

At last the Law, St. Paul points out in his Epistle to the Romans, was proclaimed to make known "the exceeding sinfulness of sin."[3]

(*c*) GOD'S REMEDY TO MAKE GOOD THE FAILURE OF THE FLESH TO REPRODUCE THE ARCHETYPE.

St. Paul further tells the Romans what was God's remedy to make good man's failure. "What the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his Son in the likeness of flesh of sin and to deal with sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the ordinance of the law might be

[1] 1 John iii. 8–10. [2] Acts xvii. 30. [3] Rom. vii. 13.

fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."[1]

That brings before us the question as to the meaning of this walk, this mode of life, that comes thus with the Perfect Son, which, although a life in the flesh, is not after the flesh but after the Spirit.

Of that let us now make our study.

XIV. THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT.

The following points, then, we would present as claiming our attention with regard to the Flesh (*nephesh, psychē*) and the Spirit, as the Spirit is to rule in those who have 'put on' this New Man, the Christ.

(*a*) THE PSYCHIC IS IN ITSELF NEUTRAL AS REGARDS MORALITY, BUT, WHEN FREE WILL WAS INTRODUCED INTO IT, THE NEED FOR A MORAL DECISION WAS AT ONCE LAID UPON IT.

First, it is for us to notice that indeed in itself the psychic is simply animal, that is, is without free will, and consequently neutral in regard to morality. It was, accordingly, as we have seen, from our study of the second and third chapters of Genesis, by his fashioning of the archetypal man in the psychic that God put the archetypal man to the test. The failure of the archetypal man in that medium to obey God showed to man that for some reason or other he was weak in self-discipline in that medium. It gradually dawned upon him that he did not as yet possess sufficient measure of the Spirit for the throwing off of the temptations that in that medium assaulted him. We cannot but see here the purpose of God, that man should be thus driven to pray to the Father for more of the Spirit whereof he had been begotten.

This breakdown, we have learned, was a sign that a different nature from the original had set in. In the 'copy,' as we are told the Jews call it, the nature of the 'original' had become quite altered. True, man was still 'son,' still 'in the image of God,' but the sonship had become devitalised, the image despoiled. His giving way to temptation was not an

[1] Rom. viii. 3, 'flesh of sin,' RV. margin, being the literal translation of the Greek. 'To deal with sin' is Dr. Moffatt's translation of *peri hamartias*, literally 'concerning sin.'

act of God's son, but showed that he had in that giving-way become the child of the Devil.

(*b*) WE ARE TAUGHT THAT A MAN'S NATURE IS EITHER GOOD OR BAD.

How serious is this! Here are two natures, the primal seed of the heavenly birth on the one hand, and the after-seed sown by the Enemy. A man is the good wheat or the evil tare. In the spiritual world, we are taught, there is no debatable land in which a man may dwell. One is either in the kingdom of light or in the kingdom of darkness. Here is the 'great gulf' of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. On one side or the other of it a man must be.

We are reminded of the verse of the Welsh poet, Lewis Morris:

> So fine the *impassable* fence
> Set forever 'twixt right and wrong.[1]

Yet, as we have said, the primal seed is not lost. God's son can never cease to be God's son. So is there a deep-set contrariety in the sinner: Two natures within! That fact is the source at once of the terrible misery and of the never utter-hopelessness of the prodigal. The 'seed of perfection,' as our poet names it, is 'there' and is 'waiting.' The New Testament, indeed, rings with hope, not despair. To all throughout Jewry repentance is preached both by St. John the Baptist and Jesus. Jesus shows us in his Parable the prodigal still 'a son,' and he depicts recollection of that as making the prodigal rise and return to his Father, who welcomes him back as his son. St. Paul tells the Athenians that now, inasmuch as God has now "appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained, he commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent."[2] That is, the whole world is called.

(*c*) THE DE-VITALISED ARCHETYPE (THE 'WAITING SEED') NEEDS TO BE QUICKENED BY THE SPIRIT.

So then, the archetypal man, God's ideal of man, man made by God in God's image and after his likeness, man as he ought to be, still lingers in each man as a seed, the

[1] From "The Enigma" in *Songs of Two Worlds*. [2] Acts xvii. 30 31.

'waiting seed, concealed or unconcealed, of perfection,' that Walt Whitman celebrates in his poetry, 'the King' of Æ.

But the evil nature that has entered through man's vain trust to maintain with an inadequate strength of the Spirit the archetype in the psychic has not only reduced the archetype to a mere 'seed,' but has taken from the seed all its vitality. St. Paul tells the Colossians that they were "dead through their trespasses and the uncircumcision of their flesh [i.e. the sinfulness of the psychic]" until they were "quickened together with Christ."[1]

So, although the seed is there, 'concealed or unconcealed,' what is necessary is a birth of the man yet again from on high, so that the archetype may revive. Nicodemus may marvel and protest, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?"[2] Yet that new birth must be. Accordingly, we find St. Paul telling the Corinthians that "if any man is in Christ there is a new creation,"[3] and the Galatians that "neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation."[4]

Here, therefore, it is necessary to wait for the Spirit 'with power.'[5] The Eternal Son is begotten of the Spirit. "The Second Adam," St. Paul tells us, the Adam of the first chapter of Genesis, made in God's image and after his likeness, male and female, yet in whom essentially there "can be no male and female,"[6] "the man out of heaven" is "a life-giving spirit." "Of[7] the Spirit," the new birth must be, Jesus declares to Nicodemus. Only as "begotten of the Spirit," he tells him, can a man "see and enter the kingdom of God," the kingdom of which the man out of heaven is vice-regent, that dominion over the earth declared in the first chapter of Genesis as given by God to man in God's image and after God's likeness.

And that Kingdom of the Perfect Son we have found revealed later to be indeed greater than the form of it set

[1] Col. ii. 13. [2] John iii. 4. [3] 2 Cor. v. 17. [4] Gal. vi. 15.

[5] See App. iv., p. 335, on the unique character of the Spirit from Jesus glorified.

[6] Gal. iii. 28.

[7] In the phrase 'begotten of the Spirit' or 'begotten of the Holy Spirit,' 'of,' is a translation of the Greek preposition *ek*, 'out of.' That is to say, while God in his Fatherhood is the Father, the Spirit is the Mother of the man from above.

before us in Genesis. We will remember what we have read in the Colossians: "In him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him and unto him; and he is before all things and in him all things consist."[1] "*All* things," in the full sense of the term, St. Paul tells the Corinthians, God hath put "under his feet;"[2] and, in the end, when all the Son's enemies, the last enemy being death, shall be abolished, his Kingdom delivered by him to the Father, and he himself subjected to the Father, God shall be all in all.[3]

(*d*) The Contrast between the Flesh as it has come to be in Man and the Spirit.

What now of the 'old man, the psychic man,' as St. Paul calls him, the archetype that, in his being fashioned of earth and inspired with an animal, passionate, life (*nephesh, psychē*), had, since he lacked sufficient strength of the Spirit, given way to the Tempter?

The 'old man' now is, or should be, completely gone, the 'new man' has, or should have, completely taken his place. We are reminded of the process described in the Taittirīya Upanishad in which one person after another that filled the personality is ousted, each in his turn completely filling it, head, arms, body, and lower limbs.[4] So now, in this case, the man that is psychic is no more; the man that is spiritual has, or should have, entirely taken his place. The man is now to be completely spiritual.

That had to be. St. Paul warns the Romans that "they that are in the flesh cannot please God."[5] In the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians he draws out the contrast between the sowing to the flesh and the sowing to the spirit. A man who sows to the flesh, he declares, is sowing corruption, dishonour, weakness; he who sows to the spirit—incorruption,

[1] Col. i. 16.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 27. Professor Heinrici points out that the quoting here of Ps. viii. 7, makes clear that the subject is God. [Meyer's *Kommentar*, 8.]

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 26–28.

[4] TU. (pp. 77–82).

[5] Rom. viii. 8.

honour glory.[1] And thus briefly to the Galatians: "He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap everlasting life."[2] The reason is plain. The psychic as such is mortal, and, besides, being invaded by sin is invaded by death, which is sin's wages.[3] The man in whom the Spirit rules completely is immortal.[4]

(*e*) The Position St. Paul takes with regard to the Flesh.

We accordingly would thus understand the position St. Paul takes with regard to the flesh. We shall remember that 'the flesh' in its narrow meaning is simply the body, the material envelope as it were. In its full and proper meaning it is whole animal nature with its appetites and emotions and also what is regarded as the self that resides therein. We therefore discover the apostle beating his body, the material part of his nature, black and blue, lest

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 42–44. Heinrici points out in Meyer's *Kommentar* that the sowing here described is not thought of only in the sense of burial. Rather, it is the present life that is here regarded as the time of sowing, in contrast with the future life, which is to be the time of reaping what is now being sown.

[2] Gal. vi. 8.

[3] Rom. vi. 23.

[4] Professor Heinrici on 1 Cor. xv. 44, in Meyer's *Kommentar*[8] has these remarks on the psychic and the spiritual bodies:

"The psychic body is the body that is the instrument of the *psychē*. The *psychē* is the potency of the life of the senses which is a perishable life. The *psychē* determines the constitution of that body. It possesses in it, as Oecolampus and Theophylact say, the lordship and leadership. This body is the organ of the *psychē*, and accordingly is adapted to it.

"We are not to think of the spiritual body as aetheric, or as a body made of spirit, as if the spirit was something material, but, as St. Paul makes clear, a body possessed by the Spirit in contrast to the body possessed by the *psychē*. To put the matter in detail: the spiritual body is spiritual because, on the one hand, the Spirit, which is the power of the supersense, eternal, life (the true, imperishable *zōē*) the life in which the holy Spirit has its workshop of regeneration and sanctification (Rom. viii. 11, 16), shall be its life-principle and the determinative of its entire constitution; and, on the other hand, because it itself shall be the organ adapted to the being of the Spirit for the Spirit's unhindered activity.

"That the *psychē* is not regarded by St. Paul as eternal is plain from his regarding it as belonging to the Flesh (see 1 Cor. ii. 14). Yet we are to remember that the Spirit is bestowed already in this life to the believer, and that it is through the Spirit that the continuity of development before and after the resurrection is assured. We are to notice, however, that that continuity is not to be regarded as a natural process, but as effected by the gracious will of God, who has endowed the believer with the Spirit and, after the departure out of the earthy body, has prepared for the Spirit the body that corresponds to it (2 Cor. v. 1)."

he may become a castaway,[1] because he recognises that although the body of the flesh is, because of sin, to be reckoned dead,[2] it still has, like the scotched snake, a potential spirit-weakening vitality. At that comparison of ours there comes to mind Yājnavalkya's description of the body deserted at the final deliverance as the slough cast off by a snake. There at last, for Yājnavalkya, is the thorough riddance. The whole man of the flesh, we are to notice (not only the material envelope, but the self as well that has its seat in the flesh) is with the Indian sage as with the Christian apostle to be regarded as dead. We shall remember that Yājnavalkya requires that he for whom the flesh is thus cast off and left to fall into dust shall be the man who has no desire, but whose only desire is the Self in itself, the Self that is Spirit indeed. "Ye are dead," says St. Paul to the Colossians.[3] "No more live I. I die daily," he says of himself.[4] The apostle acknowledges indeed that the body may bear witness very distinctly to the manner of life of its possessor: 'Henceforth let no man trouble me,' he says to the Galatians,[5] 'for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus.' Yet, on the other hand, he feels that the flesh may hinder true appreciation. "Henceforth," he tells the Corinthians, "we know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more."[6] We have also to recollect what Jesus says in St. John: "The flesh profiteth nothing."[7]

(*f*) THE FLESH IN HIM WHO PUTS ON THE NEW MAN IS ENTIRELY FORSAKEN. THE WHOLE MAN IS NOW FILLED WITH THE SPIRIT. OF THE SPIRIT ALONE HE TAKES COGNISANCE AND IS COMPLETELY UNDER ITS RULE.

Gathering together what we have learned, we see that the Spirit is to be completely and solely dominant in the man who has put on Christ. Although he lives in a body, "provision

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 27, 'beat black and blue,' RV. 'buffet.' Greek, *hyp-ōpiazō*, 'prop, *to beat black and blue, to smite so as to cause bruises and livid spots*; in this passage, like a boxer to buffer the body, handle it roughly, discipline it by hardships.' [J. H. Thayer's *Grimm's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*.]

[2] Rom. viii. 10; vi. 11.

[3] Col. iii. 3.

[4] 1 Cor. xv. 31; Gal. ii. 20.

[5] Gal. vi. 17.

[6] 2 Cor. v. 16.

[7] John vi. 63.

for the flesh, to fulfil its desires"—to quote again St. Paul[1]—is to be no more his concern. Although those desires be innocent such as joy in the outward meeting, as distinguished from the inward spiritual fellowship, of friend or acquaintance (even of the greatest or most revered) they are not to be cherished. The man's strenuous endeavour will now be to make solely and entirely the Spirit his desire.

We shall recollect that this (with such ideas as they had of the Spirit) was also the aim of the devotees we have been studying of Hindustan. In our second, Brāhmaṇic, Selection, we see the One Creative Self pass the psychic life (produced by him with such toil and from which he found such glory and might to arise) completely into the fire, offering it to himself as Death, who is utterly empty and on nothing but himself dependent. And of such sacrifice of the flesh, both in asceticism and in satisfaction at the prospect of the body's destruction on the funeral pile, the Hindus, as we know, have all along been the upholders, certain of them with an extravagance that has astonished the world.

Again we will remember how Yājnavalkya sets forth the condition, when at last the flesh shall be entirely abandoned and so the Self come to be solely itself, as Spirit, only Spirit, and as a condition of glory.[2]

(*g*) Yet the Flesh has its Glory.

And yet the flesh *has* its glory. This to a certain extent is realised among the Hindus. Do we not find Satyakāma's face shine, and does not Śvetaketu's name mean 'whiteness'? And we read in the latest of the principal Upanishads, the Maitri, from which we have a brief Selection,[3] of a certain ascetic, an honourable Knower of the Self, Śākāyanya, who was 'like a smokeless fire, burning as it were with glow.'[4] But this glory is not in the flesh at all. The flesh is simply a transparency through which the Self shines, as is the glass of a lamp for its indwelling flame. Indeed, be it that, with the lamp, the flame warms that which it shines through, here there is no inter-play between the glorious Presence and the body conceived to enclose it. We will remember the unconcernedness of the Self in Sāṇḍilya's

[1] Rom. xiii. 14.
[2] BAU. 4.4.7 (pp. 128, 190); 'glory,' **tejas**, p. 37.
[3] Selection 23.
[4] Maitri Up. 1.2.

Creed, and how that comes to a climax in Yājnavalkya's insisting that the Self is not moved by either the good or the evil that it does. With the Christian the Word which was with God and was God 'becomes flesh,' and it is in the flesh that the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, is beheld. Through the whole of the Gospel of St. John Jesus with all the wonder that men behold wrought by him and in him is always a man in the full sense of the term. It was to maintain that actuality of the flesh that, as we have seen, the Evangelist wrote his Gospel. In his First Epistle he declares that the prophet that denies the verity of the body of Jesus gives utterance to the spirit of Anti-Christ.[1] St. Paul, making clear to the Corinthians his distrustfulness of the flesh, as we have already recorded, yet expresses to them his rebuke, with regard to an impurity in their midst, in these words, "Know ye not that your body is a sanctuary of the Holy Spirit which is in you?"[2] and tells them later that he himself bears about in the body the putting-to-death of Jesus that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in his body. He bids the Romans present their bodies to God "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which," he says, "is their reasonable service."[3] Still more! For him, while the body is to be put-to-death in so far as it is prone to temptation, it receives because of the indwelling Spirit life from God. Thus he writes to the Romans: "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Jesus from the dead will give life also to your mortal bodies because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you".[4]

(*h*) Yet the Body awaits Redemption.

Nevertheless we are taught that the body is not yet redeemed. We have for the present to wait for its complete rescue into the realm of the Spirit. In the same Epistle to the Romans the apostle describes "the groaning and travailing in pain of the whole creation until now," and then adds, "And not only so, but ourselves also who have the first-fruits

[1] 1 John iv. 3.

[2] 1 Cor. vi. 19, RV. (margin).

[3] Rom. xii. 1. James Moffatt translates: "That is your cult, a spiritual rite."

[4] Rom. viii. 11. R. F. Weymouth's translation.

of the Spirit groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." "By hope," he says, "we were saved."[1] Yet has the flesh, as we have seen, even in this present waiting-time, its glory.

(*i*) The Spirit a means to Efficiency.

We shall at once infer from what has been said that the allowing the Spirit to have complete control cannot mean a decrease of the body's power and efficiency. Nay, rather the opposite should be the result. We are to remember that the Spirit is the Spirit of the Creator. Surely it was no mere rhetorical fancy of the great American preacher, Bishop Phillip Brooks, when he claimed that for Jesus the heavens were a clearer blue. Where the Spirit of God has complete control must not the flesh, peculiar contingencies apart, be the healthier and more vigorous? The poet recognised that who sang with regard to one of his heroes: "His strength was as the strength of ten, because his heart was pure."

Nor does it mean inactivity. Nay, here again, as we have pointed out, is the opposite. Jesus in St. John, referring to his healing of the infirm man at the Pool of Bethesda, told the Jews: "My Father worketh even until now and I work."[2] We shall remember the Parable Jesus relates of the Talents in which the servants are commended for trading according to their ability and the servant who did nothing is condemned.[3] We have heard Jesus in St. John in the Parable of the Vine warn his disciples that every branch that beareth not fruit his Father taketh away, and every branch that beareth fruit he cleanseth that it may bear more. Later on he says: "Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit and so shall ye be my disciples."[4] St. Paul, in the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (which begins with the exhortation we have quoted that those to whom the Epistle is sent are to present their bodies to God as a living sacrifice) proceeds presently to recount active capabilities bestowed by God that are to be exercised. In the Second Epistle to Timothy, a man is exhorted to be "a vessel unto honour, sanctified, meet for the master's use,

[1] Rom. viii. 22–25.
[2] John v. 17.
[3] Matt. xxv. 14–30.
[4] John xv. 1–8.

prepared unto every good work."[1] In the First Epistle of St. Peter the hearers are similarly enjoined to minister the gifts God has given them: "If any man speak, speaking as the oracles of God, if any man minister, ministering as of the strength which God supplieth, that in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ."[2]

Moreover, this activity under the direction of the Spirit has in it eternity. St. John in the First Epistle, after having denounced the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vain glory of life, which, he says, are "not of the Father, but of the world," adds these remarkable words: "The world passeth away and the lust thereof but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever."[3]

In fact we are to believe that in this New Man, this Man out of heaven, the Man entirely spiritual, the man in whom the flesh is dead, man as God made him, the divine image and after the divine likeness, embodied in flesh, but not of the flesh, is the true master of all that is physical, set upon the earth to replenish it and to subdue it, appointed to be the tutor of nature, an instrument towards the consummation in which God shall be all in all. This humanity, viewed in its multiplicity, is evidently those 'sons of God' for the revealing of whom St. Paul tells us the creation earnestly waits, longing to be delivered from its bondage of corruption into the liberty that shall be bestowed upon it when these sons of God, thus come to be revealed, shall be shown in their glory.[4, 5]

XV. THE SUCCESSIVE DEPTHS OF THE SELF REVIEWED FOR OURSELVES.

Let us now with the guidance of our experts inspect the successive depths of the Self for ourselves.

(*a*) The Degenerate Self.

First, let us take our stand with Walt Whitman, as he views the crowds as they return home near sunset westward in the ferry boats to Brooklyn from business in the Great

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 21. [2] 1 Pet. iv. 11.
[3] 1 John ii. 16, 17. [4] Rom. viii. 19–21.
[5] For comparison of the presentation of the Spirit among the Āryans with the presentation of it in the Bible, see Appendix IV.

Western Metropolis. He is one with them all, with all then crossing and with all that have crossed in the past and shall cross in the future. In all he discerns himself, the limitless self.

Flood-tide below me! I see you face to face!
Clouds of the west—sun there half an hour high—I see you also face to face.

Crowds of men and women attired in the usual costumes, how curious you are to me!
On the ferry boats the hundreds and hundreds that cross, returning home.

Others will watch the run of the flood-tide.
Others will see the shipping . . . and the heights . . .
Others will see the islands large and small.
Fifty years hence, others will see them [*scil*, the crowds] as they cross, the sun half an hour high.
A hundred years hence or ever so many hundred years hence, others will see them.

It avails not, time nor place—distance avails not.
I am with you, you men and women of a generation, or ever so many generations, hence.
Just as you feel when you look on the river and sky, so I felt.
Just as any of you is one of a living crowd, I was one of a crowd.
I too lived. Brooklyn of ample hills was mine.
I too walk'd the streets of Manhattan island and bathed in the waters around it.
I too felt the curious abrupt questionings stir within me.
I too receiv'd identity by my body.
That I was I knew was of my body, and what I should be I knew I should be of my body.[1]

And then the poet enters more deeply into the One Self that is himself and the self of others:

What gods can exceed these that clasp me by the hand, and with voices I love call me promptly and loudly by my highest name as I approach?
What is more subtle than this which ties me to the woman or man that looks in my face?
Which fuses me into you now, and pours my meaning into you?
We understand then, do we not?[2]

[1] From *Crossing Brooklyn Ferry*, §§ 3, 5. [2] *Id.*, § 8.

Here then is what he teaches us: I am present in all things, and all things are somehow present in me. As he says elsewhere:

> I do not ask who you are. That is not important to me.
> You can do nothing and be nothing but what I will infold you.[1]

And he declares in his bluff, abrupt, fashion how oblivious of themselves are those who do not thus infold each one whom they meet:

> Whoever walks a furlong without sympathy
> Walks to his own funeral, drest in his shroud.[2]

In this way perhaps we may express the poet's teaching for ourselves in prose: I am he or she around me, whoever they be, he or she (the Self knows no sex) in his or her separate will and circumstance. Thus, it is I who am the poor distressed. It is I too, again, who am the tyrant, in the will and circumstance that are his. I am also the judge, as a judge. I am the prisoner in the dock, and the condemned man presently taken to the cell. I am the rich merchant, as a rich merchant. I am the broken man, broken. I am the humblest subject of the King, as the humblest subject; yes, I am the King too, as a King.

Nor may we, to keep to what our poet declares, stay at the rational life. It is I who am looking out of the great patient eyes under the shaggy brows of the oxen I pass on the highway. I am the fragile butterfly dancing there a few hours in the sunshine. I am the bright-petalled flower over which it dances. I am the great trees above me. I am each of these in their several existences. The rock? Yes. That is me, as a rock.

In brief, we may put it this way: every person, everything round me is myself were I at that point of time-space and in that grade of being, voluntative or non-voluntative.

How seldom we think of this! Yet is it not true? And of how great advantage it would be if thus we would habitually regard ourselves, our neighbours, and the world! Only when we get inside do we get a true view and are able to make a just judgment. If each of us would realise that he, or she, or indeed it, with whom or with which I may have to do, is myself, possessed of his or her will, or with its absence of will,

[1] From the *Song of Myself*. [2] *Id.*

in his or her circumstances, in his or her or its grade of being, how different would be our mind and our conduct with regard to our fellow men and women and the dumb creation around us! The command 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' would have a new sanction: Thy neighbour *is* thyself. Indeed the very material things round us would, we can see, be more likely to get their due. We should wish to have each set in its proper place and put to its proper use in the world. In our consequently fairer and better adapted surroundings and with our increased sense of reverence and charity, we should find ourselves happier.

We have noted how exactly this view of others is the teaching of our Indian Forest Fathers[1]; and how, extending 'others' to its widest meaning, they celebrate the homage of all things to him who in all things sees the Self.[2]

Yet we are to remember that there are two depths of the Self with its world. There is, as we have seen, the upper depth, distressed by sin, indeed (we have had solemnly told us) radically altered thereby, the Self degenerate; and there is the lower depth, where the tide of the Self runs in the strength and purity of its divine source, the Self, that is to say, in its True Manifestation.

So, evidently, if our judgment and sympathy, whether with regard to ourselves or others, is to be helpful, indeed if it is to be a true judgment and true sympathy with the men and women we meet, we must get to the lower depth, to the Self as it ought to be. There we shall find the true man, and accordingly have given to us the proper exemplar for reference.

But it is just here that we find our Poet, who has given us such a sense of intimate fellowship, disappoint us. He lingers at times in the upper, distracted, sin-altered, levels of humanity with approval, as if he had found man as true there as anywhere. In fact, he seems to applaud the victims he brings before us. And roundly his contemporaries found fault with him for it. Thus he declaims:

> What blurt is this about virtue and about vice?
> Evil propels me and reform of evil propels me. I stand indifferent.

[1] See note 'That is the Self,' p. 179. [2] Selection 18.

I moisten the roots of all that has grown.
The pleasures of heaven are with me and the pains of hell are with me.
I find one side a balance and the antipodal side a balance,
Soft doctrine as steady help as stable doctrine.[1]
Prodigal, you have given me love—therefore I to you give love!
O unspeakable passionate love.[2]

This is not in accordance with what the poet must have met, when, in the preparation days for his poetry, while reading other literature, he 'went through,' as he tells us,[3] 'the Old and New Testaments thoroughly.'

With a 'thorough going through' he must have read in the Parable of the Tares that in the field (which is the world), where the good seed had been sown, the enemy of him who had sown the good seed had come while men slept (that is, while human nature was unaware), and had sown tares also among the wheat; and must have met the interpretation thereof, that that was the Devil sowing his retrograde children, in contrast to the good seed which was the sons of the kingdom. Two natures thus among men. The teaching of the Sermon on Mount that men differ as trees, some of which are by nature good, others by nature corrupt, accordingly presented in parable. And the width and the depth of the mischief wrought he must have found declared by St. John: "The whole world lieth in wickedness. All that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the vain glory of life is not of the Father, but is of the World."

So the poet needs reading with caution. And that he himself acknowledges.

These leaves conning you con at peril,
For these leaves and me you will not understand.
They will elude you at first, and still more afterward.
I will certainly elude you.
Even while you should think you had unquestionably caught me, behold!
Already you see I have escaped you.

For it is not for what I have put into it that I have written this book;

[1] *Song of Myself*, § 22.
[2] *Id.*, § 21.
[3] In his *Backward Glance o'er Travel'd Roads.*

Nor is it by reading it you will acquire it;
Nor do those know me best who admire me and vauntingly praise me;
Nor will the candidates for my love (unless at most a very few) prove victorious;
Nor will my poems do good only—they will do just as much evil, perhaps more.
For all is useless without that which you may guess at many times and not hit, that which I hinted at;
Therefore release me and depart on your way.[1]

Yet we have found how keen is his appreciation of the evil in men, the 'other self,' as he called it, different from the self one shows outwardly, 'the duplicate' of every one, 'skulking and hiding as it goes,' very different from the self 'smartly attired, countenance smiling, keeping fair with the customs.' We have heard him call it 'death under the breast-bones, hell under the skull-bones,' and bid it 'Come out from behind the screen.'[2] Nor does he ignore the evil in himself. He elsewhere declares himself to be 'one with the rest.' He imagines himself to be addressing future generations and confesses:

Nor is it you alone who know what it is to be evil.
I am he who knew what it was to be evil.
I too knitted the old knot of contrariety.[3]

Also, we have noticed how he rejoices that "enclosed safe within earth's central heat, amid the measureless grossness and slag, nestles the seed perfection, concealed or unconcealed," in which everyone has a share.

Indeed he is a reformer, or a would-be reformer, at least a prophet of hope, all the time. In one passage he acknowledges

Through me forbidden voices,
Voices of sexes and lusts, voices veil'd, and I remove the veil,

and then he says (apparently believing that simply to unveil will reform)

Voices indecent by me clarified and transfigured.[4]

[1] From "Whoever you are holding me now in hand," in *Calamus*.
[2] From *Song of the Open Road*, § 13, quoted on p. —.
[3] From *Crossing Brooklyn Ferry*, § 6.
[4] *From the Secret Song of Myself*, § 24.

and, after the line we have just quoted above ("The pleasures of heaven are with me and the pains of hell are with me"),[1] he adds:

> The first I graft and increase upon myself. The latter I translate into a new tongue;[2]

We have seen indeed that he has 'halos' for all.[3] And here is his philosophy:

> What behaved well in the past or behaves well to-day is not such a wonder;
> The wonder is always and always how there can be a mean man or an infidel.[4]
>
> Endless unfolding of words of ages!
> And mine a word of the modern, the word En-Masse.
> A word of faith that never balks;
> Here or henceforward it is all the same to me; I accept Time absolutely.
> It alone is without flaw. It alone rounds and completes all.
> That mystic baffling wonder alone completes all.[5]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> All truths wait in all things;
> They neither hasten their own delivery or resist it.
> I believe the soggy clods shall become lovers and lamps,
> And a compend of compends is the meat of a man or woman,
> And a summit and flower there is the feeling they have for each other,
> And they are to branch boundlessly out of that lesson until it becomes omnific,
> And until one and all shall delight us, and we them.[6]

Such his philosophy. It is a belief in the efficacy of Time. He expresses it thus in prose in his *Backward Glance o'er Travel'd Roads*: "I fully believe in a clue and purpose in nature, entire and several; and that invisible spiritual results, just as real and definite as the visible, eventuate all concrete life and all materialism, through Time."

If that means that things improve by an unconscious power, we shall surely prefer what, in contrast to the Poet's philosophy, is evidently the Poet's faith, what indeed he himself claims to be the One Burden of his song. Unconscious process ignores the individual. The very core of

[1] P. 291. [2] From the *Song of Myself*, § 22. [3] *Id.*, § 21.
[4] *Id.*, § 22. [5] *Id.*, § 23. [6] *Id.*, § 30.

his poetry on the other hand is the exaltation of the individual. We shall remember his exclamation:

> I swear I begin to see the meaning of these things.
> It is not the earth, it is not America, who is so great.
> It is I who am great or to be great, it is You up there, or anyone.
> The whole theory of the universe is directed unerringly to one single individual—namely to You.[1]

and how it is for the individual he reserves his halo:

> . . . no head without its nimbus of gold-color'd light,

and thus proceeds:

> O I could sing such grandeurs and glories about you!
> You have not known what you are. You have slumber'd upon yourself all your life.
> Through angers, losses, ambition, ignorance, ennui, what you are picks its way.[2]

Or this, which we have from *With Antecedents*—which meets us as his own answer to his philosophy that Time of itself reforms—

> O but it is not the years—it is I, it is You.
> We stand amind time beginningless and endless. We stand amid evil and good.
> All swings around us. There is as much darkness as light.
> The very sun swings itself and its system of planets around us.
> Its sun, and its again, all swing around us.
> I know . . . that where I am or you are this present day, there is the centre of all days, all races;
> And there is the meaning to us of all that has ever come of races and days, or ever will come.[3]

(*b*) The Self in its true Manifestation.

So our gaze is repelled by the evil we see. We mark that we are told in the Scriptures that a radical change in the *Self* is the cause. At the sight of the gloom and the recognition of the cause, we let our eyes drop with abasement, and lo! we find ourselves gazing upon the well of the Spirit that is set deep within the heart of each one of us, the calm untroubled spring from which arises all that exists, the fount of all righteousness, truth, and spiritual joy and peace;

[1] From *Blue Ontario's Shore*, quoted on p. 248.
[2] From "To You" in *Birds of Passage*, quoted on pp. 258–9.
[3] § 2 in "With Antecedents" in *Birds of Passage*.

and behold we catch sight, on the surface thereof, of our Self in its Truth, the man that each of us ought to be, the 'waiting seed of perfection' of Walt Whitman's poetry, 'the King' of Æ, the Only Reformer of the Evil Self and its world, the man made in the image and likeness of God, the Son, who is one with the Father, there in his perfection, sinless, all-righteous, true to the image and likeness and Sonship. The sight at once by its contrast reveals the cause of our horror at our Self in its present condition, and gives us the certainty, if we only have faith, of our reformation.

For in Jesus has the Perfect Son come. In him is the perfect obedience, the complete triumph of the Spirit over the Flesh. Hence the song of the Angels at his birth, giving glory to God in the highest, proclaiming that peace had come to the earth, even the good will of God unto men. Hence, in the artist's pictures, the halo round the head of the Child and the delicate colour. These are tributes to the presence of 'the King' in his beauty.

Here, therefore, is the One through whom we are saved by the Father. Without him we are overcome by our sins. Nor can we without him make progress in righteousness. In him is the perfection that the Father requires of each one of us. No sinner can stand before God. At last are unbroken loyalty and sinlessness here incarnate. "He that hath the Son," says St. John, "hath eternal life.. He that hath not the Son hath not the life."[1]

But whence this perfection? We will remember what Jesus said to the rich young man, who, inquiring of him what he should do to inherit eternal life, called him "Good teacher": "Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one, even God."[2]

(*c*) The Ultimate.

Thus are we led to look deeper into the Self: to look beneath this manifestation of the Perfect Man which we behold in Jesus, to gaze into the dark profound well of the Spirit, the Ultimate, the source of all holiness and righteousness, whence, as a white glory, the Perfect Man rises.

When we thus recognise that within we must look for the spiritual, we become aware that we suffer much from

[1] 1 John v. 11, 12. [2] Mark x. 18.

distant conceptions of God. Sir Isaac Newton, sharp-witted student of the motions of the sun and the planets, humble Christian Theologian as he was, looked up to the 'infinite space' overhead and claimed it to be God's 'sensorium.' It was there, in that infinite space, he thought, that God, whom he admitted to be 'incorporeal, living, omnipresent,' 'saw, discerned, and understood everything most intimately and with absolute perfection.'[1] Immanuel Kant speaks of 'the starry heavens above and the moral law within,'[2] and, as the phrase falls upon our ear, we are apt to think it means that it is that same space-conceived magnitude—unspeakably grand as we all must admit it to be—hung with its multitudinous fires, that constitutes the Spirit that rules, which is the last meaning that prince of philosophers can have intended to convey. Better than such phrases, which draw our attention to material space, are the words in which in Deuteronomy Moses tells Israel that the word he transmits to them (of the voice which they down in the plain had heard speaking on the mountain-top) was "not in heaven to be fetched thence, nor beyond the sea, but in their mouth and in their heart that they might do it."[3]

Altitude and distance do give an impression of majesty, but we are to beware of treating them as any other than helpful but inadequate means of apprehending the spiritual. The pictures we all have to hold, more or less, in our minds, such as of God throned in the clouds and his Perfect Son there in the height, have their use, but also their inadequacy. To conceive God as seated within we soon discover to be the safest and best way of realising his presence. In the heart are the emotions of the Spirit that bespeak him. There too we hear the voice of conscience, his voice of authority. It

[1] The idea is brought forward at the close of his Questions in the *Optics*: "Do not these phenomena of nature make it clear that there is a being incorporeal, living, omnipresent, who in infinite space as his sensorium sees, discerns, understands, everything most intimately and with absolute perfection?" [Quotation from *The General Principle of Relativity* by H. Wildon Carr, p. 91.]

[2] The statement is at the close of his *Critique of the Practical Reason*: "Two things fill the soul (*Gemüt*) with always new and increasing wonder and reverence (*Ehrfurcht*), the oftener and more attentively the meditation employs itself with them; the starry heaven above me and the moral law within me." [Quotation from Paul Deussen's *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*, II, 3, p. 273.]

[3] Deut. xxx. 11–14.

is consequently there that we should more and more accustom ourselves to feel is the height where he sits in his glory, presenting himself to our gaze not in blind lifeless matter, but in the flesh of the Perfect Son, seen, heard, and with the hands handled, whom he has made in his own divine image and after his likeness.

It is this indwelling of the Supreme on which we have found our Upanishad sages insist. We have had Śāṇḍilya confess that "the Person made of purpose, made of mind, whose body is life (**prāṇa**), whose form is light, whose conception is truth, whose self is space, containing all works containing all desires, all odours, all tastes, smaller than the smallest, greater than the greatest, greater than the atmosphere, the sky, these worlds"—"the Spirit," as he also called him—was "the Self within his heart." We have listened to Uddālaka's "That are thou," and to Yājnavalkya's "He breathes with your breathing."[1] A famous verse of the Kaṭha Upanishad[2] puts it this way in abstract fashion:

> The Self-existent (**svayaṁ-bhū**) pierced the openings [of the senses] outward;
> Therefore one looks outward, not within himself (**antar-ātman**).
> A certain thoughtful man, while seeking immortality,
> Beheld with the eye turned inward[4] the Self (**Ātman**) face to face.[5]

On this Yājnavalkya loved to expatiate. We will remember his recital to Maitreyī in his farewell instruction: "As all waters meet in the sea, so do all touches meet in the skin, all tastings in the tongue, all odours in the nose, all sounds in the ear, all intentions in the mind, all knowledges in the heart, all actions in the hands, all journeyings in the feet."

And a long paean, as it were, working this out still further, he declaimed, on a certain important public occasion, to his old teacher Uddālaka, who had related that he and certain students of the sacrifice had been asked if they knew the thread by which this world and the other world and all things were tied together, for, said the questioner, "He who knew

[1] BAU. 3.4.1. [2] KU. 4.1.
[3] 'thoughtful man,' **dhīra**, from √**dhī**, 'think.'
[4] 'turned inward,' **ā-vṛtta**, lit. 'turned hither.'
[5] 'face to face' [H], **praty-ag**, lit. 'turned towards, reflected.'

that thread and so-called Inner Controller knew Spirit, the worlds, the gods, the Vedas, created things, the Self, everything." To which Yājnavalkya replied that he knew that thread and Inner Controller. "He is your Self," said he, "the Inner Controller, the Immortal." Then he noted how it is "He who dwells in the Earth, yet is other than the Earth, whom the Earth does not know, whose body the earth is, who controls the earth from within—He is your Self, the Inner Controller, the Immortal." Similarly he declared "That is he who dwells in the waters, the fire, the atmosphere," and so on, "not known by any of these, but controlling them," "this One," who is "your Self, the Inner Controller, the Immortal." Then he passes on to humanity. "He it is who, dwelling in the breath, is other than the breath, whom the breath does not know, whose body the breath is, who controls the breath from within." Similarly he speaks of him as "He who dwells in the speech, the eye, the ear, the mind, the skin," and so on, "who is other than these, whom these do not know," and ends each description with the same refrain: "He is your Self, the Inner Controller, the Immortal." Finally, the sage thus sums up his declamation: "He is the unseen Seer, the unheard Hearer, the unthought thinker, the ununderstood Understander. Other than He there is no hearer. Other than He there is no thinker. Other than He there is no understander. He is your Self, the Inner Controller, the Immortal."[1]

On the mystery of the One Self our Men of the Spirit dwell. They teach that nothing indeed can bring the One Person, who is in all of us, the light in the heart, within the limits of our comprehension. Thus Yājnavalkya instructs Janaka: "That Self is not this, not that (neti, neti). It is unseizable, for it cannot be seized. It is indestructible, for it cannot be destroyed. It is unattached, for it does not attach itself. It is unbound. It does not tremble. It is not injured."[2]

We have heard the same divine, in his paean, just quoted, on the Self which he declaimed to his old teacher, conclude with the insistence that the One Seer is never seen. These Men of the Spirit would have heartily agreed with the First Article of the Church of England that God (for this 'One

[1] BAU. 3.7. [2] BAU. 4.4.22d.

Person' we recognise to be for them, as far as God was revealed to them, what 'God' is for us) 'without body, without parts,' although it is he in whom all body and parts and all movements in the world are conceived. The concluding lines of the 'Canzonet,' as we called it, that Yājnavalkya quoted to Janaka regarding the one Golden Person, the swan flying by itself in mid-heaven, will come to mind, of which we here give Professor Hume's prose translation:

> People see his pleasure-ground
> Him no one sees at all.[1]

Yet, although unseen, unheard, ununderstood, this One Person was, they taught their disciples, all the time seeing, hearing, understanding, although not as seeing, hearing, understanding, knowing, are realised in the bodily senses. He was for them, we may say, 'the living God' of whom our First Article, to notice it again, speaks, although, as the reader will remember, when they began to philosophise they conceived him so unregarding, so unaffected, even with regard to the good and the evil in the world he had breathed out and was believed to control.

The reader may remember Yājnavalkya's detailed description to Janaka in our Twelfth Selection[2] of the activity of the senses in the hidden depth of the One Person. We quote some articles in the original prose.

"Verily, while he does not there [in that immortal depth of his] see [with the eyes], he is verily seeing, though he does not see (what is [usually] to be seen[3]); for there is no cessation of the seeing of a seer, because of his imperishability [as a seer]. It is not, however, a second thing, other than himself and separate, that he may see.

"Verily, while he does not there taste, he is verily tasting, though he does not taste (what is [usually] to be tasted[3]); for there is no cessation of the tasting of a taster, because of his imperishability [as a taster]. It is not, however, a second thing, other than himself and separate, that he may taste.

"Verily, while he does not there speak, he is verily speaking, though he does not speak (what is [usually] spoken[3]); for there is no cessation of the speaking of a speaker, because

[1] BAU. 4.3.14. [2] The Source of Consciousness (BAU. 4.3.23–31), p. 121.
[3] An addition in the Mādhyaṁdina text. [H.]

of his imperishability [as a speaker] It is not, however, a second thing, other than himself and separate, to which he may speak.

"Verily, while he does not there hear, he is verily hearing, though he does not hear (what is [usually] to be heard[1]); for there is no cessation of the hearing of a hearer, because of his imperishability [as a hearer]. It is not, however, a second thing, other than himself and separate, which he may hear.

"Verily, while he does not there think, he is verily thinking, though he does not think (what is usually to be thought[1]), for there is no cessation of the thinking of a thinker, because of imperishability [as a thinker]. It is not, however, a second thing, other than himself and separate, of which he may think.

"Verily, while he does not there know, he is verily knowing, though he does not know (what is [usually] to be known[1]); for there is no cessation of the knowing of a knower, because of his imperishability [as a knower]. It is not, however, a second thing, other than himself and separate, which he may know."

Perhaps we may picture it in this way to ourselves in our daily walk. I look upon myself and those whom I meet. In us all is the One Person. It is he who, unseen, and seeing, yet not as we see, is looking out of all eyes; hearing, yet not as we hear, in all ears; walking, yet not as we walk, in all feet, yea, walking in the humblest. All voice is his voice (we shall remember that was stated in our First, Brāhmaṇic, Selection). As two converse, it is he who is speaking, within the will and mind of each, yet not as we speak. All thinking is his, and all knowledge, yet he does not think as we think, or know as we know. All strength is his strength, yet not as ours is his strength. All life is his, yet he does not live as we live. It is related of a certain Hindu that, looking on the sunset as it kindled and flung its crimson and gold to the zenith, he cried "These are the colours of my Lord." True, yet these are but presentations of a glory that entirely escapes our conception. All movement is his, however stupendous, however minute; yet his movement is different from ours.

[1] An addition in the Mādhyaṁdina text. [H.]

This wonderful view of ourselves and the world, is it not the mystery acknowledged, with some of its detail related, in the answer given by the scribe, when (our Lord having pronounced the First Commandment to be "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord, is One: and Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all. thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength," and the second ('like unto it')[1] to be "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself") the scribe replied: "Of a truth, teacher, thou hast well said that He is one; and there is none other but He"[2]; and in what St. Paul declared to the wise men at Athens: "In Him we live and move and have our being"[3]; and in the Apostle's other statement: "Of Him and through Him and unto Him are all things"[4]?

One, and yet regarded by our Upanishad divines as in two grades. The first is the unseen, unknown condition, being the foundation grade or root, where, although unseen, unknown, he is seeing, knowing, thinking, and so on, although not as we see, think, and know. The second is the upper grade or inflorescence, in which He who is thus unseen, yet ever active within everything, comes to sense-awareness, has his faculties perceived, and felt in exercise after the manner of the flesh, becomes manifest in bodily manifestation and in the qualities and motions of things.

His presence indeed it is that makes everything to be what it is and as we experience it.[5] We will remember that our Forest Fathers' philosophy is a philosophy of Being; and that what seemed to us to be the contrast, briefly stated, between Uddālaka's and Yājnavalkya's form of it was that, while Uddālaka's might be summed up in 'Being is the Self,' Yājnavalkya's might be summed up in 'The Self is Being.' Being is the core of both the old Master's teaching and the teaching of his successor.

So we are not to think of the Self as in any of its forms crushed out.

According to this philosophy it is because of the One Self that the individual is an individual, the thing—a thing. Each pupil is addressed with 'That art thou.' Aśva-pati,

[1] Matt. xxii. 39. [2] Mark xii. 28–34. [3] Acts xvii. 28.
[4] Rom. xi. 36. [5] BAU. 2.1.20.

when he lays his hand across his brow, indicating that there resides the Universal Self, tells his inquirers that the man who knows that eats food in all worlds, in all beings, in all selves. As to things, it is because the Self is the 'inner thread' that the thing is a thing. In fact, without the Self, we are assured, no self and no thing could be self or thing.

XVI. THE SELF CREATIVE.

Let us notice now the relation our Upanishads have to tell us of the Self, the Spirit, to Creation.

In our Introduction we described how the thought of the World-Person dominated the early Āryan mind. The self as we each know it in ourselves was little thought of and, when it was thought of, was regarded as alien and in thorough subjection to the World-Person. This World-Person, realised as a gigantic man lifted high above all, was the Creator.

But there were certain of those people who were much moved by a power they called **brahman**, because it 'expanded' (√**bṛh**) their hearts with hymns and prayers. That they should be so moved was for them a matter of high congratulation. They called themselves Brahmins, that is 'Men of the **Brahman** (the Spirit).' This **brahman** they believed to be a being in itself (in early times semi-personal; in later times, apparently, a sort of fluid) that coursed throughout the world close outside them as well as within them. They found that their prayers voiced by the Spirit were often wonderfully effective in bringing about certain events and that effectiveness of their utterance they were not slow to impress upon their patrons.

So it came to pass after a time that, while they still taught that the World-Person far above all created the World, they also taught that the **brahman**, the Spirit, created the world.

We have described how these two conceptions of a high-uplifted World-Person and a sprite-like Spirit became de-objectified and connected until the Classical doctrine of the Upanishads was arrived at, namely, that the Self as the Self is One everywhere and is none other than the Self each man realises as resident in his breast, and that the Self and the Spirit are the same power; or, giving the Self, as they did, the paramount place, the Self is the Principal and the Spirit

his energy or quality. It was accordingly the Self, even the Self as we know it in our breast, that had, as the Spirit, created the world and was still in the world a creative power.

This we find recorded in the Great Collection of the Secret Teaching in the Forest in a commentary on the Ritual: "In the beginning this world was the Self alone in the form of a Person. Looking around, he saw nothing else than himself. He said first 'I am.' Thence arose the name I. . . . Verily he had no delight. Therefore one alone has no delight. He desired a second." Then we read how he divided himself into man and woman. The creation of the lower creatures follows. After that comes the passage: "He knew: 'I indeed am this creation,[1] for I emitted it all.' Thence creation became." Then there follows this remarkable statement with regard to the Self as each of us is conscious of it: "Verily, he who has this knowledge comes to be in that creation of his."[2]

And, later on in the Commentary we find it said: "Verily in the beginning this world[3] was Spirit (**brahman**). It knew only itself (**ātman**): 'I am Spirit!' Therefore it became the All [or, as Belvalkar and Ranade translate, 'Brahman became everything there is']." "Whoever of the gods became awakened to this, he indeed became it." Likewise in the case of seers (**ṛṣi**). Likewise in the case of men. Seeing this indeed the seer Vāmadeva began:

"I was Manu [i.e. the First Man] and the Sun."

"This is so now also. Whoever thus knows 'I am the Spirit!' becomes this All. Even the gods have not power to prevent his becoming thus, for he becomes their self (**ātman**)."[4]

The 'gods' here referred to are the many powers, conceived for the most part personal, some of them, such as **ṛta** (law), impersonal, that, these Men of the Spirit believed, ruled in the world. We will remember the great Varuṇa, controlling the gods and men in righteousness. Also there

[1] **sṛṣṭi**, prop. 'a creating.' See **sṛṣṭi**, p. 176.
[2] BAU. 1.4.1–5 (Selection 9).
[3] The Sanskrit is 'this' (**idam**). The usual translation in such connection is 'this [world]'. But Oldenberg here translates it with 'dies (*Seiende*)' ('this [being]').
[4] BAU. 1.4.10 (Selection 8).

will come to mind Indra, the storm-god, Sūrya, the sun-god, and so on. Hitherto these had seemed to be external powers with no connection with their worshipper. The teacher here declares that these are really in their several powers the worshipper himself. It is he who, as Indra, is raging in the storm. He is Sūrya, the sun that shines down, and so on.

What does this mean but that the Self that is in each of us, the Self the depth of which none of us can fathom, yet which we are conscious of as dwelling within us, the Self whose quality is Spirit, is the source in which is contained all that is fundamental, be it in the world of physical energy to the outmost stars or in the world of life, or the innermost movements that are movements of the Spirit itself?

Such the teaching in the just quoted Commentary on the Ritual. Such also after its manner the teaching of Yājnavalkya. We will remember how he instructed Maitreyī with regard to the Self, the One Person whom he declared to be in the breast of all of us: "Out of this Great Being (**bhūta**) has been breathed forth that which is Rig-Veda, Yajūr-Veda, Sāma-Veda, the Atharvāngirasas [Hymns], Legend (**itihāsa**), Ancient Lore (**purāna**), Sciences (**vidyā**), Mystic Doctrines (**upaniṣad**), verses (**śloka**), Aphorisms (**sūtra**), Explanations (**anuvyākhyāna**), Commentaries (**vyākhyāna**), sacrifice, oblation, food, drink, this world and the other, and all beings"[1]; and "This priesthood (**brahmā**), this kingship (**kṣatram**), these worlds, these gods, these Vedas, all these beings (**bhūta**), everything here, is what the Self is."[2]

XVII. MIND AND LIFE IN THE UNIVERSE.

Following up what we have just quoted, we might record briefly what the Upanishads, our Scriptures, and recent scientific investigators, say as to mind and life in the universe.

With regard to the Upanishads we have what is told us in our Early Brāhmaṇic Selection No. 2, where the Creator brings forth the psychic world as the embodiment of his Mind begotten from his Voice. We shall remember that the

[1] BAU. 4.5.11 (Selection 13, p. 134).
[2] BAU. 4.5.7 (Selection 13, p. 133).

term mind (**manas**) in Sanskrit includes not only reason but also will and emotion.

We are told in the account of Creation given us on the first page of the Bible that God (the Supreme Person) made the world, that his Spirit moved at the outset upon the face of the waters, and that it was by his Word and his making that He made it.

St. John, we have seen, taking up the account, tells us that the Word of the Father was himself God and that it was through him that the Father brought everything that exists into existence, that in him (the Word) was life, and the life was the light of men. More! not simply the life of men, but became embodied, 'became flesh,' 'a man,' 'seen,' 'heard' (and 'with our hands handled,' he adds in his Epistle).

The words of the hymn will come to mind:

The Son of God His glory hides
With parents mean and poor;
And He Who made the heavens abides
In dwelling-place obscure.

Those mighty Hands that rule the sky
No earthly toil refuse;
The Maker of the stars on high
A humble trade pursues.

Later on in the Gospel we find the Word become flesh announcing to the Jews that "as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself"; and, in the verse that follows, declaring that "[to the Son] the Father gave authority to execute judgment because he is the Son of Man."[2]

[1] Hymn 78 in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (Complete Edition).
The Historical Edition of *H. A. & M.* states: "The hymn is by J. B. de Santeuil, and was first published in his *Hymni Sacri*, 1689. It was adopted in the Paris Breviary, 1730, as the Lauds hymn for Sunday in the weeks after the Octave of the Epiphany." The Edition gives the following as the Latin of the verses we have quoted:

satus Deo, volens tegi,
elegit obscurum patrem;
qui fecit aeternas domos,
domo latet sub paupere.

caelum manus quae sustinent
fabrile contrectant opus;
supremus astrorum parens
fit ipse vilis artifex.

[2] John v. 26, 27.

Here then is the intimate connection revealed to us of the Creator and mind and the world, and between the Creator and mind and life and man. The Son who is God is declared to be the Word at the beginning, the enunciation, that is to say, of the Father's mind, whereby all that exists was brought by the Father into existence, and, later, is found, when manifest in the flesh, announcing to his hearers, alluding to himself, that the Father, who has life in himself, has given to the Son also to have life in himself.

This declaration of the connection of mind and man with the universe is remarkably testified to by recent scientific researches.

Take, first, the testimony of our diligent and inspiring astronomer, Sir James Jeans. He finds by his investigations the space-time world to be a world of thought. "Nature," he says, "is found to work according to the laws of pure mathematics[1]; and the uniformity of nature proclaims the self-consistency of the mind displayed therein."[2]

"This concept of the universe as a world of pure thought throws a new light," he says, "on many of the situations we encounter in our survey of modern physics. We can now see how the ether, in which all the events of the universe take place, could reduce to a mathematical abstraction, and become as abstract and as mathematical as parallels of latitude and meridians of longitude. We can also see why energy, the fundamental entity of the universe, had to be treated as a mathematical abstraction, the constant of integration of a differential equation.[3]

"The universe is thus a universe of thought. Then, its creation must have been an act of thought. Indeed the finiteness of time and space almost compel us, of themselves, to picture creation as an act of thought; the determination of the constants such as the radius of the universe and the number of the electrons it contained imply thought, whose richness is measured by the immensity of these quantities. Time and space, which form the setting for the thought, must have come into being as a part of this act. . . . Modern scientific theory compels us to think of the creator as working outside time and space, which are part of his creation, just as the artist is outside his canvas. . . . And

[1] *The Mysterious Universe*, p. 134. [2] *Id.*, p. 140. [3] *Id.*

yet, so little do we understand time, that perhaps we ought to compare the whole of time to the act of creation, the materialisation of the thought."[1]

And thus the great astronomer discourses on the consequent relation of the universe of matter to man:

"We discover that the universe shows evidence of a designing or controlling power that has something in common with our individual minds. . . . the tendency to think in the way which, for want of a better word, we describe as mathematical. And, while much in the universe may be hostile to the material appendages of life, much also is akin to the fundamental activities of life; we are not so much strangers or intruders in the universe as we at first thought. Those inert atoms in the primeval slime which first began to foreshadow the attributes of life were putting themselves more, and not less, in accord with the fundamental nature of the universe.[2]

"It is probably unnecessary to add that, on this view of things, the apparent vastness and emptiness of the universe, and our own insignificant size therein, need cause us neither bewilderment nor concern. We are not terrified by the size of the structures which our own thoughts create nor by those that others imagine and describe to us. . . . The immensity of the universe becomes a matter of satisfaction rather than awe; we are citizens of no mean city."[3]

Next, we have this carried on farther by General Smuts, in his Address, as President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in 1931.

He pointed out what we have just heard from Sir James Jeans, that "the machine or mechanistic world-view, dominant since the time of Galileo and Newton, is now, since the coming of Einstein, being replaced by the mathematician's conception of the universe as a symbolic structure of which no mechanical model was possible."

"This space-time relativity concept of the world," he went on to say, "has destroyed the old concept of matter, and reduced it from a self-subsistent entity to a configuration of space-time—in other words, to a special organisation of the basic world-structure. If matter, then, is essentially immaterial structure or organisation, it cannot fundamentally

[1] *The Mysterious Universe*, p. 144–5. [2] *Id.*, p. 149. [3] *Id.*, p. 143.

be so different from organism or life, which is best envisaged as a principle of organisation; nor from mind, which is an active organiser. Matter, life, and mind thus translate roughly into organisation, organism, organiser. The all-or-none law of the quantum, which also applies to life and mind, is another indication that matter, life, and mind may be but different stages or levels of the same activity in the world which I have associated with the pervading feature of whole-making."

He emphasised 'the free creativeness of mind' as being, 'even more than life, a principle of the whole-making.' This creativeness of mind was possible, he said, because, as he had already pointed out, the world had now been discovered to consist ultimately not of material stuff but of patterns, of organisation, the evolution of which involved no creation of an alien world of material from nothing. The purely structural character of reality thus helped, he said, to render possible and intelligible the free creativeness of life and mind, and accounted for the unlimited wealth of fresh patterns which mind freely created on the basis of the existing physical patterns.

The highest reach of this creative process was seen in the realm of values, which was the product of the human mind. Great as was the physical universe which confronted us as a given fact, no less great was our reading and evaluation of it in the world of values, as seen in language, literature, culture, civilisation, society, and the State, law, architecture, art, science, morals, and religion. "Without this revelation of inner meaning and significance the external physical universe would be but an immense empty shell or crumpled surface. The brute fact here receives its meaning, and a new world arises which gives to nature whatever significance it has. As against the physical configurations of nature we see here the ideal patterns or wholes freely created by the human spirit as a home and an environment for itself."

He described the process of evolution, the passing of the universe, essentially 'genetic and holistic,' as he holds it to be, from its microscopic origins to its present macroscopic status [on which we have just found Sir James Jeans so eloquent]; and the emergence of the phase of life and mind, as a new high level.

"It was recognised now," he went on to say, "from what we know, not only of organic evolution, but also [as he had already pointed out] of the new physics, that the essential character of the universe does not preclude new creation, and that there are indications of a certain measure of free movement and creativeness throughout the world which increases in life and mind and in the emergence of new values. Within the deterministic limits of the universe the human spirit may thus have an assured status and a certain measure of creative free play."

"In our world-picture we see emerge," he said, "a streaming protoplasmic tendency, an embryonic infant world, throbbing with passionate life, and striving towards rational and spiritual self-realisation. We see the mysterious creative rise of the higher out of the lower, the more from the less, the picture within its framework, the spiritual kernel inside the phenomenal integuments of the universe. Instead of the animistic, or the mechanistic, or the mathematical, universe, we see the genetic, organic, holistic universe, in which the decline of the earlier physical patterns provides the opportunity for the emergence of the more advanced, vital and rational, patterns.

"In this holistic universe man is in very truth the offspring of the stars. The world consists not only of electrons and radiations, but also of souls and aspirations."[1]

XVIII. THE WORLD-PERSON IS LOVE.

With all this disclosing of holistic creative power we shall not be surprised that, when we traverse inquiringly the teaching that has been given to us, we should discover that evidently a root-quality of the character our experts have described of the Self is Love.

(i) THE UPANISHADS.

(a) The World is the Creation of the Person.

In the Brāhmaṇic accounts of Creation that are our First and Second Selections we have the universe portrayed as a sacrifice, an entire self-surrender of the Self, that the All, in its wholeness and in every item, may possess selfhood (being).

[1] *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1931.

In the later teaching, in spite of the indifference of the Person as such that is insisted upon, it is confessed by a Sāṇḍilya that in the Person are all desires; that, as realised in the heart, he is both within the smallest and outside the greatest; that he is in fact the Being of the world. And the sage closes his Creed with the words: "Into him I shall enter on departing hence," and evidently feels the entering in to be a satisfaction, for he at once adds: "If one would believe this, he would have no more doubt."

Indeed, the main point, as we have seen, of the Upanishad teaching is that the Self gives to everything that thing's individual existence. Uddālaka we have found informing his son Śvetaketu that Being, one without a second, made the World to exist, and the primordial elements he set agoing having evolved, he entered into them with his living self and separated out (or 'unfolded'[1]) 'name and form,' which Professor Hume tells us is the Sanskrit idiom for 'individuality.'[2] And the teacher drives the point home by stating to the pupil that it is Being of such a character that constitutes the pupil's own reality.

(*b*) *The Reality of the World.*

It cannot be argued: Here is no love inasmuch as these teachers held that the world thus created is a delusion. In another Ritual Commentary in the Great Collection of the Secret Teaching in the Forest, beside the two Commentaries we have just mentioned that are our First and Second Selections, we are told that "The world is a triad of name, form, and work. Although it is that triad, this Self is One; and although it is One, it is that triad. That [triad] is the Immortal covered by the real (**sat-ya**). Life (**prāṇa**, breath) [a designation of the Ātman[3]], verily, is the Immortal. Name and form are the real. By them this Life is concealed."[4] In yet another Ritual Commentary of the same Collection, after we are told that: "As a spider by means of its threads goes out from itself, as small sparks come forth from the fire, even so from this Self come forth all vital energies (**prāṇa**), all worlds, all gods, all beings ['all these selves' is added in a passage[5] in the Great

[1] CU. 6.3.2, translation in CS.
[2] Note on CU. 6.3.2.
[3] H.
[4] BAU. 1.6.
[5] Śata-patha Br, XIV. 5.1.23.

Commentary of the Hundred Paths, which is one of the two recensions in which this text of the Upanishads comes before us[1]]," there comes this statement: "The mystic-meaning[2] (**upanishad**) thereof is 'the Real of the real (**satyasya satya**).' The vital energies (**prāṇa**), verily, are the real. He is their real."[3] Of this last passage Oldenberg says: "Thus the manifold is not a deception. It is, so to say, a Being of second order." He quotes with approval Griswold's comment, "Reality presents itself as a thing of degrees."[4] We shall remember that we noted in our Introduction that Professor E. W. Hopkins points out that in the Upanishads the world is found to be real because it is a form of the subjective, and that he deems that to be 'the great discovery' to be laid to the credit of the Upanishad teachers.[5]

(*c*) *The Indispensability and Beneficence of the Person.*

We are left indeed in no doubt as to the indispensability of the Person to the Other and of his beneficence. Yājnavalkya teaches Maitreyī that the priesthood, the knighthood, the worlds, the gods, the things, whatever they may be, around us, are no longer priesthood, or knighthood, worlds, gods, or things, if they are known by us in aught else than the Self. Whatever we think we possess is lost to us unless known in the Self.[6] For both Uddālaka and Yājnavalkya the Self is the thread within all things that binds them together, although things know him not.[7] For Yājnavalkya the Self is 'the giver of good.'[8] And this indwelling and beneficence is answered by affection. It is the love of the Self that makes everything dear. The husband, the wife, wealth, priesthood, and so on, are only dear because it is the Self, which makes each of these what it is, that we really love.[9] We will remember the Rapturous Song of the Exalted Self in the Taittirīya Upanishad:

> I am food! I am food! I am food!
> I am a food-eater! I am a food-eater! I am a food-eater!
> Who gives me away, he indeed has aided me!
> I who am food, eat the eater of food![10]

[1] See Oldenberg, *Lehre der Upanishaden*, p. 127, note.
[2] H. [3] BAU. 2.1.20. [4] Oldenberg, in work just quoted, p. 89.
[5] P. 44. [6] BAU. 2.4.6 (p. 133). [7] *Id.*, 3.7 (p. 297).
[8] *Id.*, 4.4.24 (p. 130). [9] *Id.*, 2.4.5a (p. 132).
[10] TU. 3.10.6 [H] (p. 83).

It is, of course, this inclusion by the Self of itself in the Other, and the responding inclusion by the Other of itself in the Self, that is the reciprocity that constitutes Love.

(ii) WALT WHITMAN.

And, this mutuality as a feature of the Self we have observed to be the continuous theme of our mystic poet of the new democracy, Walt Whitman, as he found himself to be in all that was round him and all that was round him to be within himself.

(iii) CHRISTIANITY.

And, behold the perfection indeed of mutuality in the One Perfect Life who was the Word by means of whom everything that exists was brought into existence, in whom was life, the life which was the light of men, who became flesh, who declares himself in St. John to be as the Vine with its branches, one with his chosen and his chosen one with him (a relationship perpetual between him and his own as he draws all men into himself), who is now reaching his fulness in all things that he may himself at last be subjected to the Father in order that God who is Love may be all in all.

Let us then trace with wonder our Christian revelation of God as Love, the Father bringing to expression by his Spirit through his Son the Other and yet again and again the Other—for where may Love stay in creating?—in which shall be reflecting mirrors more and more capable of response until that fulness of reciprocity of mind and will between the One and the Other that love requires be attained.

Have not we who have been listening to our Indian sages had a fore-glimpse of this in our First and Second Selections which depict Creation as the Great Sacrifice of the One of himself in the All and in each item thereof? What marvellous light, we will further notice, have we had thrown upon it by what the investigations of modern science, as by our experts recounted in the last chapter, discover the universe to be!

First then, are brought by the Father into existence through his Son things; that is, beings stationed at a point in space-time that each none may occupy save itself, while round each as centre an infinite sphere extends; thus endowed so far by the Father with his self-hood; each so far capable

of being by the Father indwelt; each, so far as these qualities go, enabled to respond to his love. Yes, indeed, in these congeries of atoms the response never fails, and while we deem that in the gyrations of their electrons there is no will, yet we may well feel inclined to say of material things with Blake:

> If the sun and moon should doubt
> They'd immediately go out.[1]

At all events, in that material world the obedience of the Other to the One is complete. As another poet puts it of our great luminary:

> Look up to heaven. Th' industrious sun
> Already hath his course begun.
> He cannot halt or go astray,

(and he adds the strange fact

> But our immortal spirits may.)

Thus through the Eternal Son was the foundation stratum of the Other and yet again the Other laid, the stratum in which the reciprocity between Creator and created is, as we see it (unless we have the intuition of a Blake) merely mechanical.

But more! Behold in this mechanical (as we deem it) world the planting of a new province in which the possibilities of the love of the Creator are still further developed! We read 'in the Word was *life*.' Here we have more and more the growth of a quality that is more than the possession of a sole point in space-time. Here is not the unique thing, but the animal individual, the dulled personality (shall we regard it so?), yet always less dulled as the evolution goes on, of the animal world. Here accordingly Love finds more and more complete exercise. Here are the lilies of the field which are clothed in brighter array than Solomon.[2] Here a sparrow falleth not without the Father.[3]

And yet more! In this psychic world we note the arrival of a higher individuality still, not only beyond, as at first, the individuality, such as it is, of the non-conscious thing, but beyond that of the subconscious animal. We now find the person, the being that knows himself to be, in position, at

[1] From *Auguries of Innocence*.
[2] Matt. vi. 28, 29.
[3] *Id.*, x. 29.

the centre of space-time, that possesses mind and will, and so can with mind realise the love of the One and with will love the One in return, and thus be a centre in which the conscious and free reciprocity (for here may be refusal as well as response) that love requires is at last attained.

Here then is the final stage. Here is the Person from whom the process began, creating in Others selfhood and a selfhood so close to his own, that each of these is (to quote our Church Catechism with regard to Baptism, in which we are confirmed in what the Scriptures maintain to be our relationship as persons to the Creator) '*the* child of God.'

Is not Love here made perfect?

XIX. WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED OF THE GLORY OF THE SELF.

May we now gather together what we have learned of the Glory of the Self?

(*a*) WHAT WALT WHITMAN HAS SHOWN US.

Again we are with Walt Whitman, leaning on the rail of one of the ferryboats that are carrying the people returning from the great Metropolis to their homes in Brooklyn half-an-hour before sunset.

> Crowds of men and women . . . how curious you are to me!
> On the ferry-boats the hundreds and hundreds that cross . . . are more curious to me than you suppose.
> And you that shall cross . . . years hence are more to me, and more in my meditations, than you might suppose.
>
> It avails not, time nor place—distance avails not.
> I am with you, you men and women of a generation, or ever so many generations, hence.
> Just as you feel when you look on the river and sky, so I felt.
> Just as any of you is one of a living crowd, I was one of a crowd.
> Just as you stand and lean on the rail, yet hurry with the swift current, I stood, yet was hurried.
>
> I too many and many a time crossed the river of old.
> What is it then, between us?
> Whatever it is, it avails not—distance avails not, and place avails not.

There then is the glory of the Self, the true Self, the limitless Self that is above, superior to, space-time.

We saw how the vision widened. He found himself integral with the dumb creatures as well as with his fellow men, integral even with the sea and the rocks, integral not only with what presents itself in man and in nature to-day but with all that had happened aeons ago and all that should happen.

More indeed! It reaches beyond the physical order. He gives us this experience which we have not yet related:

> This day before dawn I ascended a hill and look'd at the crowded heaven,
> And I said to my spirit, "When we become the enfolders of those orbs, and the pleasure and knowledge of every thing in them, shall we be fill'd and satisfied then?"
> And my spirit said, "No, we but level that lift to pass and continue beyond."[1]

So we are not surprised when we find him declaiming, as we quoted some time ago:

> I know I am deathless.
> I know this orbit of mine cannot be swept by a carpenter's compass.[2]

More still! Much more still. We found that he has halos for all. We remember his exclaiming:

> I paint myriads of heads, but paint no head without its nimbus of gold-color'd light.
> O I could sing such grandeurs and glories about you.[3]

also this:

> Nothing, not God, is greater to one than one's self is.[4]

and yet again this (in the poem "Crossing Brooklyn Ferry," from which we took our opening quotation):

> What gods can exceed these that clasp me by the hand and with voices I love call me promptly, and loudly by my highest name as I approach?

More definitely, in another poem, this:

> Swiftly I shrivel at the thought of God,
> At Nature and its Wonders, Time and Space and Death,

yet as swiftly he adds:

> But that I, turning, call to thee, O Soul, thou actual Me,
> And lo, thou masterest the orbs,

[1] *Song of Myself.*
[2] *Id.*, § 46.
[3] *To You.*
[4] *Song of Myself*, § 48.

Thou makest Time, smilest content at Death,
And fillest, swellest full, the vastnesses of Space.

Greater than stars or suns,
Bounding, O Soul, thou journeyest forth.[1]

More clearly again does he express his mind in a poem in which he declares what his work as a poet is:

Not for an embroiderer
(There will always be plenty of embroiderers. I welcome them also),
But for the fibre of things and for inherent men and women.
Not to chisel ornaments,
But to chisel with free stroke the head and limbs of plenteous, supreme, Gods.[2]

(*b*) What the Upanishad Men of the Spirit discovered.

So much for Walt Whitman! What say our quiet thinkers of old, those men of the Spirit who had withdrawn into seclusion, to meditate calmly over what might be the Self and the Spirit, the Self that each man feels himself to be, the Spirit that so mightily moved at the sacrifice. They tell us they discovered that this Person that each man realises to be the Self in his breast is the centre of all and gives to everything its existence. Is not that just indeed what the poet we have just quoted discovered?—

I swear I begin to see the meaning of these things.
It is not the earth, it is not America, who is so great
It is I who am great or to be great. It is You up there or anyone . . .
Underneath all, individuals . . .
The whole theory of the universe is directed unerringly to one single individual—namely to You.[3]

For our Men of the Forest the old gods had gone. Personality and Spirit had taken their place. The great World-Person that had loomed overhead in the sky for their fore-fathers, the Spirit that had moved so mightily in the world for them as enchanters, had become One, and that One simply Self, simply Spirit.

(*c*) The Bible Revelation.

And what say our own Sacred Scriptures?

In Genesis we are told how man, male and female, and

[1] *Passage to India*, § 8. [2] "Myself and Mine" in *Birds of Passage*.
[3] *By Blue Ontario's Shore*, quoted on p. 248.

therefore individual, was made by God in his own image and after his likeness, set to replenish the earth and subdue it.

Of this Man St. Paul has more to tell us when he writes about Jesus, whom the apostle declares to be this Man made by God in God's image and after God's likeness. He goes deeper. In Christ, he says, there cannot be male and female. He tells us that he is 'a life-giving spirit.' He is the man out of heaven. He is the Son of God. And behold his Kingdom enlarge beyond earth altogether. In him "all things were created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him and unto him; and he is before all things and in him all things consist."[1] Only the Father is, as Father, above him. The Son must reign until all his enemies are put under his reign, and then, after that victory over all, the last enemy being death, he shall himself be subjected to the Father that God may be all in all.

Greater things still are told by St. John. How close is the sonship! Here is, the evangelist tells us, in Jesus the Word with God through whom at the beginning God made all things to exist, yea who was God, become flesh, beheld possessing a glory as of the only begotten of the Father, and declaring of himself, before those that know him as a man who dwells in their midst, "I and the Father are one."

(*d*) Only the last of the Three Unveilings of the Glory satisfies.

So we have had before us three unveilings of the Glory of the Self, but surely (whatever be our final judgment as to the meaning of it all) we can only find the last of the three satisfy us. Why? Because in the first two is still the miasma that to every man's conscience, whatever his philosophy may be, gives trouble, the deadly miasma of Sin. It is plainly there in Walt Whitman's presentation of the Self, dimming the effulgence, hindering the heat, spreading disease. With the Forest hermits the Self at its true height is the high-flying Swan, a hopeless fugitive from

[1] Col. i. 16, 17.

all that may disturb him, even of the good as well as the evil he may effect.

Does not conscience contend that the Self must be sinless, alive to the joy of the good and the pain of the evil, provided the Self be as it ought to be?—that the sinful Self is untrue to itself, and cannot stand before God.

XX. A FINAL VIEW OF THE WORLD IN THE LIGHT OF WHAT HAS BEEN TOLD US.

Let us look now on the world in the light of what has been told us.

God is at the centre and we have learned that he is found within. We will remember the verse in the Kaṭha:

> The Self-existent pierced the holes outward:
> Therefore one looks outward, not within himself.
> A certain thoughtful man, while seeking immortality,
> Beheld with the eye turned inward the Self face to face.

Unseen, unknown, ununderstood, is He. Yet he is there. We are to remember that as we think of ourselves and look upon our brethren.

He is One, One Person, and yet no mere blank unity. It must always be difficult for us to bring into our apprehension the wonder of his Being. We may not in any way break up in our thought his Unity. To that both the Upanishad and the Christian teacher hold fast. Yet the Forest Hermits taught that he was both Self and Spirit, and to each of their disciples they addressed the strange, awe-inspiring, words 'That art Thou.' We will not attempt here to consider what points are here, how far the Āryan teaching and the Christian coincide and where they do not. But our theologians studying the revelation given to us in our Scriptures have found Father, Spirit, and Son begotten of the Spirit;[1] and it is the Son, the Gospel tells us, who became flesh and showed himself as a man, 'made in all things like unto his brethren.'

So is God, thus triune, within each of us, Himself unseen, unknown, ununderstood.

The Father, the ultimate source of all, remains unseen, so far as the eyes of the flesh are able to see. "No man hath

[1] See note 1 on p. 238.

seen God at any time," says St. John. Yet Jesus tells his disciples in the Sermon on the Mount that "the pure in heart shall see God." In that Sermon the future event that Jesus has in view is the coming of the Kingdom of God. So we learn that it is with the spiritual eye of the pure in heart that God is seen. That we seem to understand, for it is from Him who is the source of all holiness that the pure in heart derive their purity.

But men, begotten by God of his Spirit, are each of them fashioned in the Father's image and after his likeness. We will remember the striking words of St. James, which admonish us as to how we should rebuke and how merit rebuke—"With the tongue we bless the Lord and Father; and therewith curse we men which are made after the likeness of God."[1] Here then is a beholding in the flesh as distinguished from the simply spiritual beholding we have just had declared to us. We will recollect how in St. John, Jesus, the Perfect Son, a man, heard, seen with the eyes and with the hands handled, when, his disciples gathered together with him at the Last Supper, one of them, Philip, entreated, "Show us the Father and it sufficeth us," expressed astonishment, and said, "Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father."

The Spirit, unknown in itself as are Father and Son, comes into the known in the inspiration that bestirs the heart. We may ask, Where is He not felt? Keble, in his hymn for Whit-Sunday, writes thus regarding the Spirit:

> It fills the Church of God; it fills
> The sinful world around.

(Which latter line reminds us of Śāṇḍilya's

> Verily this whole world is Spirit.)

> Only in stubborn hearts and wills
> No place for it is found.[2]

Let us then recount the depth beneath depth of the Self.

First, we find it to be the Self just as each one of us knows it in his breast, the Self with the qualities our experts have enabled us to recognise, individuality, universality, mutuality, and so on.

[1] St. James 3[9]. [2] Whit-Sunday hymn in *The Christian Year*.

Again we discover it is the nature of the Self to be in itself alone, all else objective. With Walt Whitman we find that it looks out of every item we meet with and every item is in it. Yea, we come to intuit that all things that were in the past and all things that shall be in the future are contained in the Self.

So I come to see that my neighbour after all is myself set in the place and circumstance that are his. In the lower life too I find myself looking upon what is me, were I placed in life's lower grade. I am the driver, and I am also, as Walt Whitman puts it, each of his team. That is me as a butterfly. Even the rock and the grass are me, were I set where I see them in *their* place in nature.

Thus do we find individuality-in-universality to be the quality of the Self. In fact the Self makes the world. All is in it and It is in all.

But we are aware of a strange contrariety that, like a great rift, crosses and fractures the individuality and the universality: Sin.

But what does this recognition of the contrariety of sin, the recognition that it breaks up the individual and rends the world across, imply but that Perfection that knows no sin is the truth of the Self and its world?

So we come to catch sight of a deeper level, the Perfect Self. We will remember Walt Whitman's conviction of its presence—albeit as a seed not yet come to its flowering—concealed or unconcealed, in everyone born.

Perhaps we may cherish the thought of that, and see, in even the most outré characters we meet with, that flowering; see, that is to say, the man in each of us that each of us should be; see the King in each, as does Æ.

In this deeper view, the man that I ought to be is my own true self, and so is it also with all who are round me. We join with Walt Whitman as he sings:

> O I could sing such grandeurs and glories about you!
> You have not known what you are. You have slumber'd
> upon yourself all your life. . . .
> What you have done returns already in mockeries.
> (Your thrift, knowledge, prayers, if they do not return
> in mockeries, what is their return?)
> The mockeries are not you.[1]

[1] Poem on p. 258.

So we take a roseate view. And it is to be our faith that the roseate view is the true view. The self of me that disappoints me is *not* my true self. In all round me I am to regard the best of each as his or her truth. In the churlish neighbour I am to hold to the man of good fellowship. In the judge I am to see the judge righteous; in the culprit, the man with a conscience; in the merchant, the man who is just in his dealings; and so on with each one in his several capacity. We are to keep in view the ideal of each beneath what imperfection there may be and however deep down the imperfection may go. The ideal of each is the truth of each. So too with all things round me. The best that each can be is their truth: and, be things not so, I am to try to bring them to be so. The Best is always to be kept in view as the truth of all and their law.

But at once, having looked within so far and discovered as a conviction that the truth of every existence is its perfection, be it person or thing, there comes to our mind that only the Perfect can produce the perfect. We recollect (as we did some time ago[1]) what Jesus said to one who called him 'Good Teacher,' "Call me not good. None is good save one even God."[2] We remember how in St. John the Perfect Son declares himself 'one with the Father.' Beneath that which is perfect, whatever it is, there must be perfection's One Source. Se we come to a deeper level still. We come to the Ultimate.

And what has the Quality of the Source we now come to, but been steadily revealed to be, as we have observed, a Living Power that has an interest in what He has breathed forth? True, the Upanishad and other philosophers have found him indifferent, yet even in our Indian Thinkers in the Forest we have found traces of recognition of his care for his world;[3] and abundantly he has shown himself in Bible revelation to be the Father in whom is ever increasingly made clear his tenderness, until in the Eagle Evangelist's Epistle we find him declared to be Love.[4]

So, with this increasing revelation of the solicitude of the Supreme we are prepared to believe the news of the Mercy of God in Christ—the Mercy of which we may venture to see a foreshadowing in the later Upanishad teaching of the Rescue

[1] P. 295. [2] Mark x. 18. [3] Chap. xviii. [4] 1 John iv. 8, 16.

of the Drowning Swan[1]: "Herein is Love. Not that we loved God [of that our conscience is the more aware, the more it is quickened], but that He loved us and sent his [perfect] Son to be the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world."[2]

So then, in the Son who has been sent is the Perfect Self, the Self with its self-containedness, universality, mutuality and other virtues in their perfection; given so to us by the Father and given so in the Father's enabling us to carry out the Father's will, the Perfect Son in us according to our individual limits and in all things, and we and all things in him. He was but a sojourner, as we all are. He 'pitched his tent'[3] among us, as the Evangelist says. He manifested himself on earth in the brief space between birth and death. He was 'in the world' (indeed he was 'the true light, that lighteth every man') and 'the world was made by him'; and yet 'the world knew him not.'[4] He 'came unto his own things,[5] and they that were his own received him not.'[6] He manifested himself under the habits and thought of his age, as all men do. Such is the order of our present existence. 'In all things' (we will recollect the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us) he was 'made like unto his brethren.' Here then in all that which is material and psychic as we know it, is at last, after the trial in the psychic that has so failed, the Son of God come with power, so 'appointed,' St Paul, we have noted, tells us, 'according to the spirit of holiness by his Father raising him up from the dead.' Thus in him is each man of us saved.

Here then, at last, if only we have the 'faith of Him,'[7] is our true self, the self of each of us as God would have us, the only self therefore in which we can really live, save by the mercy of God, who waits for the sinner to be God's true child. Here, to quote our Poet, is "What we have been slumbering upon all our life." The self is here for us of our 'thrift, our knowledge, our prayers.' Here it awakes, arises, stands up in

[1] P. 45. [2] 1 John iv. 10; ii. 2.

[3] John i. 14, 'dwelt' (RV.), literally 'pitched his tent.'

[4] John i. 9, 10.

[5] 'his own things,' literal translation of the Greek.

[6] John i. 11.

[7] Gal. 2^{20}: 'faith, *the faith* which is in the Son of God,' RV. The Greek is, word for word: 'faith, the of the Son of God'; put in English form—'the faith of the Son of God.'

the flesh and blood that is ours, 'a man' 'heard, seen with the eyes, and with the hands handled.' 'The mockeries,' as the poet calls them, that are not the true 'you' are gone.[1] Here is Perfection! the condition that we are taught must be ours, and that our conscience tells us must be ours, that nevertheless lies beyond the fashion of our noblest dreams, while we yearn for it. God demands of all his creatures the perfection wherewith he has begotten or made them, each in his, her, or its, individual capacity. For the conscience perfection is the only true vision.

Of that we have evidence enough that the Forest Hermits themselves were aware. We have observed how apartness from the One in whom all things move, whom they felt to be the Self in all men, the light in the heart, the Spirit that was the power in their prayers and praises, and upon only a small part of which all creatures live, they found unbearable. We will remember the Taittirīya Upanishad: "Who indeed would breathe, who would live, if there were not this bliss in boundless space? This [essence] causes bliss. When one makes a cavity, an interval therein, then he comes to have fear,"[2] and how Yājnavalkya exclaimed "Aught than him [*or* than this] is wretched."[3]

Thus did these quietists in the forest perceive the need of the Unity, the wretchedness of the separation, but they did not realise the height the Unity of Being implied, nor (which was indeed the result of the subsequent revelation in Christ of what the height really was) the depth and darkness of the chasm.

Here then at last, in the Perfect Self now given, is the only possible fulfilment of Uddālaka's "That art thou"; of Yājnavalkya's "The One Person, in whom all things are contained, out of whom all things come, is the Self within thee, the light in thine heart"; of Śāṇḍilya's "The Person in my heart is made of light, his body the fathomless space; his conception truth, smaller than the smallest greater than the greatest, greater than the worlds, the Spirit; and, with regard to the world, of Śāṇḍilya's 'verily, this whole world is Spirit': for here is the Perfect Son to whom all things in heaven and on earth have been subjected, who is now

[1] These quotations from Walt. Whitman are from the poem *To You*. See p. 258–.

[2] TU. 7. [3] BAU. 4.2; 5.

reaching his fulness in all things[1] that he may deliver in the End his kingdom to the Father.

And what shall we say to Yājnavalkya's conclusion of his teaching, when, having described the self-existence and the self-containedness of the Self, he exclaimed, "Thus you have the instruction told you, Maitreyī. Behold, such indeed is immortality"?[2] Must we not rejoin what indeed (in spite of his insistence on indifference to good and evil in the height to be attained) the philosopher's own teaching and practice show that he himself had no feeble impression of?—Only the Perfect can live before God. He alone that hath the Perfect Son hath eternal life. He that hath not the Perfect Son hath it not.

And what shall we say to the Poet who cries 'I know I am deathless'? Must we not reply 'Only deathless if sinless'?

Accordingly here is the only Life that saves all and the world. Back to the past it reaches, forward to the future. To Him all that would be perfect (whoever and wherever they may be, be it in the Indian Forest or on this side of the mountain barrier between East and West) have been holding, in dim knowledge or in clearer. We are warned that no man has yet seen Him as He really is.[3] Hear the Perfect Son say in St. John, "I, if I be lifted up out of the earth, will draw all men unto myself."[4]

[1] Eph. i. 23. [2] BAU. 4.5.15 (p. 136.)
[3] 1 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 John iii. 2.
[4] John xii. 32 (literal translation in margin of RV.).

Appendices

APPENDIX I.

LITERAL TRANSLATION OF THE WORLD AS THE HORSE-SACRIFICE.

(BAU. I.I.)

1. Oṁ![1] Verily the dawn is the head of the Sacrificial Horse (**aśva-medhya**); the sun—his eye; the wind—his breath; universal fire (**Agni Vaiśvānara**)—his open mouth. The year is the body (**ātman**) of the Sacrificial Horse; the sky—his back; the atmosphere—his belly; the earth—the under part of his belly; the quarters—his flanks; the intermediate quarters—his ribs; the seasons—his limbs; the months and half months—his joints; days and nights—his feet; the stars—his bones; the clouds—his flesh. Sand is the food in his stomach; rivers are his entrails. His liver and lungs are the mountains; plants and trees—his hair. The orient is his fore-part; the occident—his hind-part. When he yawns, then it lightens. When he shakes himself, then it thunders. When he urinates, then it rains. Voice, indeed, is his voice.

2. Verily, the day arose for the horse as the sacrificial vessel which stands before. Its place of origin is the Eastern gathering-of-waters (**sam-udra**).

Verily, the night arose for him as the sacrificial vessel which stands behind. Its place of origin is the Western gathering-of-waters.

Verily these two came to be at both ends of the horse as the two sacrificial vessels.

Becoming a courser (**haya**) he carried the gods; a stallion (**vājin**)—the elves in the sky (**gandharvas**[2]); a 'scorcher' (**arvan**[3])—the demons; a horse (**aśva**)—human beings.

The gathering-of-waters is his relative (**bandhu**). The gathering-of-waters is his place-of-origin (**yoni**).

[1] See **Oṁ**, Voc. [2] See **gandharva**, Voc.

[3] Literally 'speeding,' from √ṛ, go.

APPENDIX II.

LITERAL TRANSLATION OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE COSMOS.

(BAU. I.2.)

1. In the beginning nothing whatsoever was here. This world was covered over with death, with hunger—for hunger is death.

Then he made up his mind (**manas**): Would that I were embodied (**ātmanvin**).[1]

So he went on (**acarat**) praising (**arcan**). From him, while he was praising, the waters were produced. 'Verily, while I was praising, I had pleasure (**ka**),' thought he. This, indeed, is the **arka** nature of what-pertains-to-brightness (**arkya**). Verily, there is pleasure for him who knows thus that **arka** nature of what pertains-to-brightness.

2. The waters verily were brightness.

That which was the froth of the waters became solidified. That became the earth.

On it he [i.e. Death] tortured himself (√**śram**). When he had tortured himself and practised austerity, his heat (**tejas**) and essence (**rasa**) turned into fire.

3. He divided his body (**ātman**)[2] threefold: [fire (**agni**) one third]; the sun (**āditya**) one third; wind (**vāyu**) one third. He also is life (**prāṇa**) divided threefold.

The eastern direction is his head. Yonder one and yonder one[3] are the forequarters. Likewise the western direction is his tail. Yonder one and yonder one[4] are the hind quarters. South and north are the flanks. The sky is the back. The atmosphere is the belly. This [earth] is the chest. He stands firm in the waters. He who knows this, stands firm wherever he goes.

4. He desired: 'Would that a second body (**ātman**)[5] of me were produced!' He—death, hunger—by mind copulated with speech (**vāc**). That which was the semen became the year. Previous to that there was no year. He bore him for a time as long as a year. After that long time he brought him forth. When he was born Death opened his mouth on him. He cried '**bhāṇ**!' That, indeed, became speech.

5. He bethought himself: "Verily, if I shall intend against him, I shall make less food for myself." With that speech and with that body (**ātman**) he brought forth this whole world, whatsoever exists here: the Hymns (**ṛc**) [i.e. the Rig-veda], the Formulas

[1] 'had a self' or 'a body' [H.]; 'selbsthaft (Körperhaft)' [D.] See **ātman** in Voc.

[2] 'himself' [H.]; 'sich selbst' [D.].

[3] 'Explained by Śaṁkara as north-east and south-east respectively.' [H.]

[4] North-west and south-west (Saṁkara). [H.].

[5] 'ein zweites Selbst (Leib)' [D.].

(**yajus**) [i.e. the Yajur-Veda], the Chants (**sāman**) [i.e. the Sāma-Veda], metres, sacrifices, men, cattle.

Whatever he brought forth, that he began to eat. Verily he eats (√**ad**) everything: that is the **aditi**-nature of Aditi [the Infinite]. He who knows thus the **aditi**-nature of Aditi, becomes an eater of everything here; everything becomes food for him.

6. He desired: "Let me sacrifice further with a greater sacrifice (**yajna**)!" He tortured himself. He practised austerity. When he had tortured himself and practised austerity, fame and forcefulness went forth. Fame and forcefulness verily are the vital-breaths (**prāṇa**). So when the vital breaths departed, his body (**śarīra**)[1] began to swell. His mind, indeed, was still in his body (**śarīra**).

7. He desired: "Would that this [body] of mine were fit-for-sacrifice (**medhya**). Would that by it I were embodied (**ātmanvin**)!" Thereupon it became a horse (**aśva**), because it swelled (**aśvat**). "It has become fit for sacrifice (**medhya**)!" thought he. Therefore the horse-sacrifice is called Aśva-medha. He, verily, knows the Aśva-medha, who knows it thus.

He kept him [i.e. the horse] in mind without confining him.[2] After a year he sacrificed him for himself. [Other] animals he delivered over to the divinities. Therefore men sacrifice the victim which is consecrated to Prajāpati as though offered to all the gods.

Verily that [sun] which gives forth heat is the Aśva-medha. The year is its embodiment (**ātman**).

This [earthly] fire is the **arka**. The worlds are its embodiments. There are two, the **arka** sacrificial fire and the Aśva-medha sacrifice. Yet again they are one divinity, even Death. He [who knows this] wards off a repetition of death. Death obtains him not. Death becomes his self (**ātman**). He becomes one of these deities.

APPENDIX III.

ON *NEPHESH* (GREEK, *PSYCHĒ*).

Nephesh is a term used in Hebrew to denote the life principle of animals as well as that of men. The following résumé of what is given in Brown Driver and Briggs's *Hebrew-English Lexicon* with regard to *nephesh* gives detail of the significance of the term in the Old Testament.

Nephesh, noun fem.

1. = that which breathes, the breathing substance or being = Gk. *psychē*, Lat. *anima*, the soul, the inner being of man.

[1] **śarīra**, properly 'the corporeal integument'; 'the body' as the hollow cover or integument of the vital breaths and the immortal soul. [√* **śṛ**, cover.]

[2] As in the Aśva-medha, the consecrated horse is allowed to range free for a year.

2. The *nephesh* becomes a living being: by God's breathing *nishmath hayyīm* ['the breath of life,' RV.] into the nostrils of its flesh; of man, Gen. ii. 7 (J.); by implication of animals also, Gen. ii. 19 (J.); so Ps. civ. 29, 30, cp. lxvi. 9; man is *nephesh hayyāh*, a living, breathing, being, Gen. ii. 7 (J.); elsewhere *nephesh hayyāh* always of animals—Gen. i. 20, 24, 30; ix. 12, 15, 16 (all P.); Ez. xlvii. 9.
3. The *nephesh* (without *h-y-h*, noun or verb) is specifically: (*a*) a living being whose life resides in the blood (hence sacrificial use of blood, and its prohibition in other uses); (*b*) life itself of animals, Prov. xii. 10, and of man, Gen. xliv. 30 (J.), etc.
4. The *nephesh* as the essential of man stands for *the man himself.*
5. *Nephesh* = *seat of the appetites*: of hunger, thirst, and the appetite in general. The *nephesh* craves, lacks, and is filled with good things. Eccles. ii. 24; iv. 8; vi. 2, 3, 7, 9; vii. 28.
6. *Nephesh* = *seat of emotions and passions*: of desire, abhorrence, sorrow and distress, joy, love, alienation, hatred, revenge, and other emotions and feelings.
7. Occasionally when with 'heart,' *nephesh* denotes mental acts, but it is doubtful whether it ever means acts of the will.

APPENDIX IV.

THE SPIRIT.

A study of how the Spirit was revealed to our Āryans and to those who are brought before us in the Bible seems to give the following results:

(i) The Exaltation of the Spirit.

We know well how in the Bible the Spirit is exalted.

We will have observed how the Āryan divines exalted the Spirit. 'Men of the Spirit' (Brahmins, 'Men of the **brahman**') they called themselves. It was the Spirit that filled with power the prayers and hymns of the priest of the early days; and with the priest of the later day Spirit filled with power his enchantment.

When we turn to the Upanishad recluses we find Yājnavalkya telling King Janaka that it was on only a part of simply Spirit that the creatures lived, that it was man's 'highest path, highest achievement, highest world.' When the sage came to count up the blisses to the King he found this bliss to be highest of all.[1]

[1] BAU. 4.3.33 (p. 122).

(ii) The Power of the Spirit.

But we notice at once the greater intensity of the Spirit in the Hebrew and Christian revelation.

The terms employed indeed have much the same meaning. If the Āryan poets called that which moved within them **brahman**, 'that which enlarges' [the heart], and themselves **brāhmaṇas** (Brahmins), that is 'men of the Spirit,' and described themselves as **vipra**, that is 'trembling with agitation,'[1] when uttering their praises, the Hebrew prophets called themselves *nābhī'* (which is the word we translate in our English version 'prophet'), a term derived from the root *nābha'*, 'announce, inform,' which Gesenius, Kuenen, and other scholars, think to be a weakened form of the root nābha', 'bubble up, pour forth,' and to refer to an agitated flow of words coming forth under the excitement of inspiration.[1] The power that moved within them they called **rūaḥ**, which means 'breath, wind, spirit.'[2] We may see the same idea in **vipra** of being shaken as by wind. Indeed, Professor Lanman finds in the Anglo-Saxon *waefre*, which means 'moving this way and that,' and from which our English *waver* is derived, a formation from an original **vip-ru-s**, now lost to us; and notes how the frequentative *whiffle* means to 'veer about, blow in gusts,' and that in the name '*whiffle*-tree' it is given to that which constantly jerks under the pressure of the wind.[3]

It is, however, when we consider the actual effects of this power that made men shake as by a wind that we come to the contrast between the Āryan and Hebrew subjection to the Spirit.

No doubt, the Āryan poets were much moved by their songs, and the enchanters of later days by their enchantments. But where with them do we meet with the deeds of frenzy to which the Spirit moved men among the Hebrews? We read how upon the newly-appointed King Saul the spirit of God came mightily and kindled his anger against a certain foreign tribe, the Ammonites, who were holding in siege a distant isolated Israelite city, so that he took a yoke of oxen, cut them in pieces, and sent them throughout the land of Israel with this summons to war: "Whosoever cometh not forth after Saul and Samuel [which Samuel was a prophet], so shall it be done to his oxen."[4] And did not the prophet just mentioned hew Agag, the King of the Amalekites, enemies of Israel in long-bygone days, in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal?[5] Similarly, we find later Elijah the prophet bid the people not to let one of the prophets of Baal escape, and himself bring them down to the brook Kishon, and slay them there.[6]

[1] [L.]

[2] See Brown Driver and Briggs's *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.*

[3] See √vip p. 12.

[4] 1 Sam. xi. 1–7.

[5] *Id.*, xv. 33.

[6] 1 Kings xviii. 40.

We witness also the strength of the Spirit with less terrible effect when we see this same Elijah after that slaughter of these idolatrous prophets, when the heavens had grown black with clouds and wind, gird up his loins, the hand of the LORD upon him, and run before the King's chariot as the King hastens home at the prophet's bidding that the rain, with the coming of which the prophet had had so much to do, should not stop him.[1] It was to that same prophet the King's Steward complained that there was no certainty where the prophet might be found, for in a moment the Spirit of the LORD might carry him whither he who sought for him knew not.[2] And we read that, at last, when there appeared a chariot of fire and horses of fire, it was in a whirlwind that the prophet went up into heaven.[3] In the same way, we find the prophet Ezekiel carried off by the hand of the LORD in the wind [or 'the spirit' (we are to remember that the word **rūah**, which is the term used in all we now relate, means 'breath' or 'wind' or 'spirit')], and carried him into a great, open, valley, full of dry bones, in which, when he is set, he is bidden to prophesy (the word *nābha'* being used) to the wind [or 'the breath,' as the margin of the Revised Version translates] that from the four winds it might come and blow[4] upon the slain that the breath [**ruaḥ**] might come into them, that they might live.[5]

We are told that on Jesus, at his baptism, the Spirit descended as a dove, a gentle stirring as that would be, of wings in the air; but forthwith the Spirit 'threw him out' [as by wind in its strength] up to the desert heights above Jordan to be tempted of the Devil.[6] When the Spirit first came upon the disciples of Jesus, sent by him from on high, it came with a sound as of a mighty wind, and as tongues like as of fire, that 'distributed themselves'[7] on each of them, so that, speaking as the Spirit gave them utterance, they spake ecstatically, seeming to those who looked on to be men filled with new wine.[8] And the Spirit continued to move the early Christians in that manner, so that on certain occasions, not knowing themselves what they said, they needed the Spirit, speaking in another Christian, to interpret their utterance.

[1] 1 Kings xviii. 45, 46.

[2] 1 Kings xviii. 12.

[3] 2 Kings ii. 11.

[4] Ezek. xxxvii. 9, 'blow,' Heb. (*rūaḥ*), *breathe, blow.* Found in Song of Songs, ii. 17, iv. 6, with reference to the day breathing, i.e. growing cool; in Song of Songs, iv. 16, of the exhaling by the garden of odours; in Prov. xxix. 8, of exciting, inflaming, a city; in Prov. vi. 19, etc., of breathing out, uttering. [Brown Driver and Briggs's *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.*]

[5] Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14.

[6] Mark i. 12; Matt. iv. 1.

[7] Acts ii. 3, one of the alternative marginal readings of the Revised Version.

[8] Acts ii. 1–13.

Yet we see in both revelations of the Spirit that the frenzy decreases and finally disappears. We shall be noticing how St. Paul teaches the inferiority of the ecstatic phase and exhorts the Church to seek for the Spirit's higher gifts. With both the later Christians and with the Forest Fathers, we find quietude has set in; with the latter, we will remember, a quietude that is a bliss that is unconcerned.

We should add to this list of passages with regard to this aspect of the Spirit as wind the passage in St. John's Gospel where Jesus tells Nicodemus that 'the wind bloweth' [or 'the Spirit breatheth,' as the margin of the Revised Version translates] where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is begotten of[1] 'the Spirit.'[2]

(iii) The Objectifying of the Spirit.

We gain further light on what the Spirit was for our Āryans and our Hebrews respectively when we observe also the manner of its objectification.

We saw that for the Hebrews the Spirit was a strong wind. For the Āryans it was in the earlier conception brought before us in the older portion of the Kena Upanishad a quasi-personal something, a sprite (**yakṣa**), an uncanny mysterious thing, with a will of its own, humorous, provoking, watchful, sub-human. It could effect mighty things, and also it could do mean things, for its patrons. Both men and gods (such gods as the early Āryans believed in) made use of it not infrequently for inferior ends.

In later times the Āryans seem to have regarded it as a sort of invisible contagion. We noted in our Brief Advice to the Reader of our Selections how the student of the brahman, when his course of study and discipline was over, had to wash his body in water before he returned to ordinary intercourse, lest what clung to him should hurt the unwary.

When we balance the two presentations we find in the strong wind a magnificent physical phenomenon, in this mysterious force a lack of material grandeur, but a mind and a will.

(iv) The Moral Quality of the Spirit.

What now of the Spirit with regard to morality?

Observing our Āryans, we shall have noticed how varied for them was the character and effect of the Spirit, this strange uncanny world-traversing force. It was the power in the hymns of old that kindled their poets with devotion and joy in the gods. It was the power too in the malignant incantations we found creeping in. At last, however, as we recorded, the falsity of the magic and the self-assertiveness and selfishness of the prayers

[1] 'of': Greek, *ek*, 'out of,' God in his Fatherhood being the Father, and the Spirit the Mother of the man begotten from above.

[2] John iii. 8.

fortified by it began to be felt. Our Upanishad sages appeared. The higher notions of the Spirit re-asserted themselves and developed. We have observed how in the Taittirīya Upanishad the man whose support (lower limbs) is the Spirit is the man who has surmounted the man made of food, the man made of breath, the acquisitive man, the intellectual man, and, as one who has risen above such sorts of man, has become a man made of bliss, of delight, yea, exceeding delight. And, when we come to Yājnavalkya, it is the man whose only desire is the Self, who has left the body entirely behind him, that enters into the Spirit, the which entrance the sage assures his eager inquirer is brilliance (**tejas**) indeed.

That is much, and yet, with all this glory realised, we shall remember that this height of the Spirit is a quietist's height, a height so quietist that he who attains it is indifferent to joy in the good or horror at the evil that he has done. Yea the Kauskītaki Upanishad will have it, with regard to the man who understands the Self, that by no deed of his is his world injured, however hideous the deed he has done may be; if he has done any evil, the bloom does not blanch in his face.[1]

Such then the movement of the Spirit among the Āryans, a movement of a much changing character. With the Hebrews, on the other hand, there was a sheet-anchor that for them kept the revelation of the Spirit from drift. And that sheet-anchor was the conviction that the Spirit that came upon them was the Spirit of an all-holy, all-righteous God, a God in comparison with whom all other gods were as nothing, the God that dwelt on the distant Mount Sinai in the wilderness, beneath the dread height of which the nation had in a far-off day the LORD's election of them proclaimed, and the commands likewise that they had promised to obey, the First of a Table of special Commands being that they should 'have none other God.' We shall remember also the revelation the LORD vouchsafed then of himself to Moses, how the LORD descended in the cloud and stood with the prophet on the top of the mount and proclaimed his name: 'The LORD, the LORD, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin: and that will by no means clear the guilty.'[2]

Let us note through all this that the hard-breathing, the Spirit, the emotion, that stirred the prophet as with a strong wind, was not itself the LORD. With the overwhelming emotion shaking his frame the prophet felt, distinct from the spirit that came from the LORD, the LORD's hand laid upon him.[3] When Elijah, distressed at his utter failure to establish the authority of the

[1] KU. 3.1. (where Indra represents the Self).

[2] Exodus xxxiv. 5–7.

[3] Elijah; 1 Kings xviii. 46; Ezek.; Ezek. viii. 3.

LORD makes the journey to Sinai to plead with the LORD face to face, the LORD shows himself to be, not in the strong wind that accompanied his Presence as he passed by, nor in the earthquake that followed, nor in the fire that then broke out, but in the still small voice, the voice of the LORD himself, that followed the fire.[1]

Very jealous for such a God, as was evidenced by their acts and their speech, were those among the Hebrews on whom the Spirit came. It was against the Ammonites and Amalekites as maltreaters of the LORD's Chosen that the Spirit moved Saul and Samuel so strongly. It was as against those who were bringing in another god, the Baal of Zidon, that Elijah bade the people gather the prophets of that Baal to the brook Kishon that he might slay them there. "I have been very jealous for the LORD, the God of Hosts," Elijah pleaded with the LORD, on the occasion we have recorded, at Sinai, "for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword."

So was the coming of the Spirit for the Hebrews an overwhelming experience that humbled the prophet, making him feel his littleness and sinfulness in comparison with the holiness and righteousness of such a God, the experience given voice to by Job:

> "What is man that he should be clean,
> And he which is born of a woman that he should be righteous?
> Behold God putteth no trust in his holy ones;
> Yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight.
> How much less one that is abominable and corrupt,
> A man that drinketh iniquity like water."[2]

What comparison is there with this and that which we have recorded of the Spirit as it presented itself and as it moved even at its highest our early Āryans! Here is no meeting with a puny, withal powerful, semi-personal, force, thrid with no guiding principle, a power, one might say, with no master save the master adopted by it at its own whim, be it a god or a man, to whose petition it might choose to accede or not, moving within its own fancy for good or for ill, finding itself at its highest a bliss indifferent to the moral quality of what it brought to accomplishment. With the Hebrews on the other hand we witness a power that overwhelms with a sense of personal unworthiness because of the awful holiness of him from whose Presence it comes, whose mysterious almighty hand was at times actually felt and seen.[3]

We note further. Thus beginning its course under a single-hearted loyalty to the All-holy All-righteous God, who had in

[1] 1 Kings xix. 9–12.

[2] Job xv. 14–16.

[3] See references already given, 1 Kings xviii. 46; Ezek. viii. 3.

his love chosen Israel as His own, the revelation of the Spirit among the Hebrews proceeds to develop, as we might expect, ever more and more moral splendour. We mark in Isaiah the description of the Spirit of the LORD that shall rest upon the glorious King of the future: "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD."[1] In the Evangelical Prophet's Declamation during the Exile, "the Spirit of my Lord,[2] the LORD," is upon him, because the LORD has anointed him to "preach good tidings to the meek, to bind up the broken-hearted, to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion that they shall be called the trees of righteousness, planted by the LORD, so that the LORD should be glorified."[3] And what shall we say to that intimate and moving revelation of the power of the Spirit that we find in the Fifty-first Psalm: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me"[4]?

When we come to the New Testament we meet new splendours still.

First, we notice the connection of the Spirit with Jesus. We have already recorded how at his baptism the heavens rent asunder and the Spirit as a dove descended upon him, and a voice came out of the heavens, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." We have related how strongly the Spirit then possessed him, casting him forth into the desert heights above the river.[5] It was by the Spirit, moving both as his spirit and as the power of God (we discover from his stern rebuke on a certain occasion to the scribes) that he cast out demons.[6] In the course of that rebuke Jesus denominates the Spirit 'the Holy Spirit,' and declares that "whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin," because, the Scripture narrative tells us, they said, "He hath an unclean spirit."

Here then we have Jesus naming the Spirit the Holy Spirit, thus mentioning what we find to be the distinctive quality of the Spirit with Jesus and all who call themselves Christian. A Beatitude upon those who are, 'pure in heart,' with its glorious reward the 'seeing of God,' is among the Eight Beatitudes pronounced by Jesus in the Collection of sayings we have of his Teaching of his disciples.[7]

We have just noted the *strength* of the Spirit as it came upon Jesus after his baptism by St. John the Baptist; how, as it had been wont to bear an Elijah, it bore him along bodily, even to the desert heights above the river to be tried by the Enemy. Here then was the ancient strength. We are told, on the other

[1] Isa. xi. 2. [2] 'my Lord,' Hebrew *Adōnai*.
[3] Isa. lxi. 1–3. [4] Ps. li. 10. [5] Mark i. 10–13.
[6] Mark iii. 22–30. [7] Matt. v. 8.

hand, in the Acts of the Apostles, that those who knew only the Baptism of John had not heard whether there *was* a Holy Spirit.[1] So different from all outpourings before of the Spirit was the outpouring that Jesus dispensed when he reached his place of triumph at his Father's right hand that it was felt that the Spirit had not been given in its authentic reality until it came from *Him* thus glorified.[2] We will remember St. Paul stating that it was according to the spirit of holiness that the Father when he raised his Son from the dead had appointed him his Son *with power*.[3]

It was meet, indeed, that in him that brought into himself both the old and the new, the Spirit should count among its effects the same as it did with the prophets of old, seizing after his baptism his physical frame and bearing him bodily to his initial contest with the Enemy. But never again do we find the Spirit affect peculiarly his bodily frame, unless we include the Transfiguration, which surely we may take to be a work of the Spirit, as also that beholding in him, we read in St. John, 'the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.' We will recollect besides how St. Paul speaks of Christians themselves 'reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord,' and as being 'transformed into that image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit';[4] and speaks also of 'God giving the light of the Knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.'[5] But we behold the Spirit in connexion with Jesus and those that are his passing steadily from peculiar display in the physical sphere to normal effects and effects in the realm of the mind.

We will note that the Spirit poured out by Jesus arrived at his Father's throne had at first its peculiar *rapture*. Its coming to men from him so stationed brought a *mental ecstasy*. The scene depicted of what took place on the Day of Pentecost that followed close upon the revelation of the Ascension presents it distributing itself as fiery tongues on the heads of the disciples all gathered together in one place on that Day, so that they spoke 'with other tongues' as the Spirit gave them utterance, tongues whose utterance he that pronounced the tongue did not understand, but needed another, also filled with the Spirit, to interpret.

But St. Paul, while he exhorts men to desire earnestly spiritual gifts, and would not have speaking with tongues forbidden, yet encourages men to seek mental gifts not ecstatic, but based upon the understanding and observant of order and that gave edification. Temporary indeed and peculiar to the individual were these ecstatic gifts, and we find the apostle entreating men to 'desire earnestly the greater gifts,' and going on to speak of love

[1] Acts xviii. 24–26; xix. 1–3 (margin). [2] John vii. 39.
[3] Rom. i. 4. [4] 2 Cor. iii. 18. [5] 2 Cor. vi 9.

and faith and hope as gifts that abide.[1] Later we find him emphasising 'the fruit' of the Spirit, that is to say, its natural product, 'love, joy, peace, long suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, inner control.'[2] The rapture of the coming of the Spirit in such new and unwonted power having passed, the peculiar by-products that accompanied were to cease and did cease.

(v) The Spirit and Creation.

Further, we mark in both Āryan and Hebrew revelations of the Spirit a connection with Creation.

Among the Āryans the Spirit not only was the energy in the Songs of the Poets, but, as we have seen, it is described in the great Hundred Paths Commentary on the Ritual, published at the close of the magic period of the ritual, as having produced from itself the World. It was all along, as we have noticed, a world-force. Śāṇḍilya's Creed, which is found in the Hundred Paths Commentary, and has come to be included in the Upanishads, opens, as the reader knows, with the statement 'This whole world is Spirit.'

In the Hebrew revelation the Spirit, [rūaḥ, breath, wind, spirit], as we have just pointed out, was no independent force called upon for help by gods or men, but an influence proceeding from the One Great God himself and under his authority. So, for the Hebrews, in the account they give of the creation of the world, while the Spirit is present and described as 'hovering' (it would seem with the idea of fertilising[3]) it is God, the Almighty Person, who summons forth and makes the creation. In Psalm one hundred and four we read: With regard to earth's creatures:

> "When thou hidest they face they are troubled:
> When thou takest away their breath (**rūaḥ**) they die,
> and are turned again to their dust.
> When thou lettest thy breath (**rūaḥ**) go forth, they shall be made: and thou shalt renew the face of the earth."[4]

(vi) Regeneration by the Spirit.

Still more! In the Christian revelation the Spirit is not only with the Father as he creates and the means by which he begets his children, it is the means of bringing them to *new* birth, and that new birth is in the *psychic*.

The necessity for that new birth was that the Divine Sonship had in the psychic become devitalised.

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 31. [2] Gal. v. 22.

[3] The margin of the Revised Version gives 'brooding' as an alternative translation of the Hebrew; and it is the opinion of Brown Driver and Briggs's *Hebrew and English Lexicon* that perhaps there is included in the use of the word in this verse the idea of 'fertilising.'

[4] Ps. civ. 29, 30. Translation in S. R. Driver's *Parallel Psalter*.

According to St. Paul the psychic man is to be regarded as 'dead through trespasses and sins,'[1] 'All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God.'[2] Man in his present condition belongs to a creation that must be changed, the apostle tells us, into another creation.[3]

According to the teaching of our Blessed Lord and St. John the world is sown by the Devil with his children. Indeed, St. John, in his Epistle, tells us that "the whole world lieth in the Evil One," and in the Gospel, Jesus tells Nicodemus that a man must be "begotten from above of [literally 'out of'[4]] the Spirit."

Here, indeed, are two differences between Upanishad teaching and Christian revelation: a difference in the character of the Spirit, and in the strength and province of the Spirit's creative power. Not only is with the Upanishad sages, as we have noted, the Spirit, at the height at which it is to be kept, completely indifferent to good act or evil, but at that height it is quite apart from the flesh. In the Christian revelation, while the Spirit is indeed settled in peace, it is moved to joy over good, to grief over evil. Indeed, the more true it is to its own nature the more sensitive is it when it meets with the good or the evil. Again the whole of the man that is begotten from above is under the Spirit's control.[5] The body indeed is not yet redeemed, but the man waits in hope for its redemption at the adoption,[6] the time when the erring sons shall at last be received as true sons.

The new creation, we are to observe, is to include the universe. The final establishment of the kingdom is called by Jesus in St. Matthew 'the Regeneration.'[7] St. Peter in the Acts proclaims that Jesus has been received up into heaven "until the times of the restoration of all things."[8]

APPENDIX V.

WESTCOTT ON HINDU THOUGHT IN GENERAL.

We give now, as we promised at the beginning of our Conclusion,[9] the view Westcott took of Hindu thought in general. He acknowledged its importance. He expressed his conviction that 'the battle' for the One Perfect Life, the only Gospel for the World, would have to be 'fought and won' for mankind in India rather than in Europe.

He regarded Hinduism as "witnessing in different ways, even through corruptions and excesses, to the ideas of revelation, of sin, of retribution, of atonement, of fellowship; as offering also,

[1] Col. ii. 13; Eph. ii. 1.
[2] Rom. iii. 23.
[3] 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15.
[4] Greek *ek*. See note on p. 331.
[5] See Heinrici, Note p. 282.
[6] Rom. viii. 23.
[7] Matt. xix. 28.
[8] Acts iii. 21.
[9] P. 231.

in an exaggerated shape, the controversies on faith and works, on freewill and fate, which have agitated Christendom."

His comment on that was, First, with regard to Christianity, that Christians, viewing that fact were thereby enabled to feel that the Faith they had received "dealt with enigmas which it did not create, and answered to wants that we had not as yet realised, and how manifest it was that 'the Holy Spirit sent in Christ's name,'[1] was still waiting to make known, in some new fashion, that the strangely-varied striving of humanity after unity and peace, the unceasing endeavour to combine the idea of personality with the recognition of dependence, the invincible effort to embody the thought that in God 'we live and move and have our being,' are all, without destroying the sense of responsibility, satisfied in the one fact of the Incarnation; that the conflict of action and worship, of the service of God and the service of men, of the Hindu doctrines of the 'way of devotion' and 'the way of works' are indeed reconciled in the one grace of holiness."

Secondly, as to Hinduism itself, he pointed out "that the presence of these problems, that were problems [as he has just averred] for Christians as well as Hindus, stated as they are in bold and even startling expression in the Hindu sacred books, gave to Hinduism its vitality, so that efforts had been made by would-be reformers thereof to purify their ancient faiths from within and bring out of them satisfaction for the contrasted wants thus witnessed." But even the noteworthy reformers of old time, he pointed out, had laboured to no effect. While these reformers themselves, it would seem, clung to the idea of "a historic connection of God and man," their followers were eventually swept back into "the excesses of superstition."

The Power of Life to Convince.

And this is how our careful thinker would plan the strategy in the great campaign. "Let it be seen," he said, "on the great and fresh field of India, that the historic Gospel meets, interprets, fulfils aspirations which are written in the records there of untold generations; that it is able to reconcile order and progress; that it gives an intelligible meaning to the prayer, recorded among these people, 'to see God in all things and all things in God'; that it is not yet exhausted by interpretations hitherto given of it, or limited by the embodiments it has taken up till now." And the grand motto he laid down for those engaged in the conflict was 'The manifestation of life is the true answer to scepticism.'

An Alexandria on the Ganges.

It was Westcott's dream in his Cambridge days, in accordance with these last-quoted remarks of his, that a College of Indian

[1] John xiv. 26.

students, trained, so he hoped, at his own university, Cambridge, should be founded to think out these problems so acutely felt by both Hindu and Christian. He recalled the Catechetical School of Clement and Origen. "Is it," he asked, "too much to hope, that on the Indus or the Ganges should rise some new Alexandria?" And when he became Bishop he named Patna on the Ganges as the place where a mission brotherhood might be. Patna, we will remember, was the capital of Aśoka, who promoted the teaching of the Buddha throughout his great empire. Whether that was in the Bishop's mind the present author does not know, or whether the Bishop was aware that the Videhas lived to the north thereof, to whose King Janaka Yājnavalkya, before the Buddha's doctrine were formulated, disclosed the classic doctrine of the Upanishads; but, as we have mentioned in our Conclusion, it was reputed of Westcott that he hoped that some Indian Christian would give an exposition of the teaching of the Forest Hermits.

The Hope of the Help of India to bring out by New Interpretation the Fulness of the Faith.

Of the greatest moment Westcott held the bringing of India to be for the development of the Christian Faith. It was his belief, he tells us, that "the Church was from the first in its essence Catholic, but no one," he said, "could overlook or mistake the different offices which the several races had fulfilled in bringing out the fulness of the Faith. Syrian, Greek, African, Latin, Teuton, had each contributed to the better understanding of the whole Gospel. And the Church waited with confidence for new interpreters. In this light we could see the grandeur of hope which lay in India and the East."[1]

The World-Influence of India.

And then his prophetic eye ranged across the world.

India brought in, he declared, would influence Asia. And Asia brought in "seemed to offer the near vision of the consummation of the kingdom of God."[1]

APPENDIX VI.

SIR GEORGE C. M. BIRDWOOD, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., M.D., ON INDIA.

[*Sir George Birdwood thus writes on India in his book* Sva.]

India, the inviolable sanctuary of archaic Āryan civilisation, may yet be destined to prepare the way for the reconciliation of

[1] *Thoughts on Revelation and Life*, being selections from the writings of B. F. Westcott, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. Edited by Stephen Phillips, pp. 132–6. Also, *Lessons from Work*, by Westcott as Bishop, p. 76.

Christianity with the world, and, through the practical identification of the spiritual with the temporal life, to hasten the period of that third step forward in the moral development of humanity, when there will be no divisions of race or creed or class or nationality, between men, by whatsoever name they may be called, for they will all be one in the acknowledgment of their common Brotherhood, with the same reality, and sense of consequent responsibility, with which, two thousand years ago, they recognised the Fatherhood of God, and again, two thousand years before that, an exceptionally endowed tribe of Semites, in the very heart of anterior Asia, formulated for all men, and for all time, the inspiring and elevating doctrine of His Unity.[1]

[1] Ps. lxxi. [lxxii.], *vv.* 18 and 19: 'Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel, qui facit mirabilia solus,' and lxxxvii. [lxxxviii.], *v.* 17: 'Et sit splendor Domini Dei nostri super nos,' etc.

Sva, p. 355–.

See p. xiv *of this Book with regard to Sir George Birdwood and his book* SVA.

Index of the Unpanishad Passages put into Verse

1. The World as the Horse Sacrifice - - BAU. 1.1.
2. The Evolution of the Cosmos - - - BAU. 1.2.
3. The Emanations from and Return to itself of the Unitive Self — TU. 2.1–5, 8c. TU. 3.4b–6.
4. Macrocosm and Microcosm - - - BAU. 5.5.3–4.
5. The Open Way at Death - - - BAU. 5.5.2.
6. A Lesson from the Creed of Śāṇḍilya - CU. 3.14.
7. What Certain Creatures of the Wilderness taught Satyakāma — CU. 4.4–9.
8. How Spirit became the All - - - BAU. 1.4.9,10.
9. The Self Creative - - - - - BAU. 1.4.5,6.
10. The Instruction given by Uddālaka to his son Śvetaketu — CU. 6.
11. The Bird of Paradise - - - - Mund. 3.1–3. ŚU. 4.6–7. Maitri. 6.18b.
12. The Instruction Yājnavalkya gave to Janaka, King of the Videhas — BAU. 4.3–4.7,22–25.
13. Yājnavalkya's Last Testament - - BAU. 2.4=4.5.
14. The World Beyond - - - - CU. 8.4.
15. The Secret Teaching given to Gods and Demons by the Lord of Creatures — CU. 8.7–12.
16. The Advantage of Knowledge of One's Nature — BAU. 2.2.1–2.
17. The Eight Wardens of the Head - - BAU. 2.2.3.
18. The Homage given by All Things to Him who in All Things sees the Self — BAU. 4.3.37.
19. The Meaning of the Thunder - - BAU. 5.2.
20. The Supremacy of the Real - - BAU. 5.5.1a.
21. The False in Truth's Embrace - - BAU. 5.5.1b.
22. The Supreme Austerities - - - BAU. 5.11.
23. The Sin-deterrent Fire - - - Maitri. 6.18c.
24. The Necessity that the Self should reveal itself to itself
    - A - - - - - - - ŚU. 1.6.
    - B - - - - - - - KU. 2.24.
    - C - - - - - - - KU. 2.23, and Muṇḍ. 3.23.
    - D - - - - - - - KU. 2.20= ŚU. 3.20.
    - E - - - - - - - KU. 2.21, 22.

Index of Abbreviations

THE THIRTEEN PRINCIPAL UPANISHADS.

Bṛhadāraṇyaka (The Great Book of the Secret Teaching in the Forest) - - - -	BAU.
Chāndogya (The Secret Teaching in the Chant) -	CU.
Īśā (The Īśā Secret Teaching) - - - -	Īśā
Kena (The Kena Secret Teaching) - - -	Kena
Aitreya (The Secret Teaching of Aitareya) -	AU.
Taittirīya (The Secret Teaching to the Partridge Disciples) - - - - - - - -	TU.
Kauṣītaki (The Secret Teaching of Kauṣītaki) -	Kauṣ.
Kaṭha (The Secret Teaching by Kaṭha) - -	KU.
Muṇḍaka (The Secret Teaching to the Tonsured) -	Muṇḍ.
Śvetāśvatara (The Secret Teaching of the Possessor of the White Mules) - - - - - -	ŚU.
Praśna (The Secret Teaching to the Questioners) -	PU.
Maitri (The Secret Teaching of Maitri) - -	Maitr.
Māṇḍukya (The Schedule of the Vedānta) - -	Māṇḍ.

CP. *Creative Period of Indian Philosophy*, S. K. Belvalkar and R. D. Ranade.

CS. *Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy*, R. D. Ranade.

D. Paul Deussen.

D.I,1. *Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanishads*, Paul Deussen.

H. *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*, R. E. Hume.

L. *Sanskrit Reader*, C. R. Lanman.

M. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, A. A. Macdonell.

RV. *Rigveda*.

VM. *Vedic Mythology*, A. A. Macdonell.

Vedic Index. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, Macdonell and Keith.

Corrigenda

Page xi, l. 19, omit the comma after 'author.'

,, xii, l. 8 from bottom, *for* 'Erster' *read* 'letzter.'

,, 9, l. 15 ,, ,, *for* 'snow' *read* 'soma.'

,, 102, l. 8, put comma after 'master-wizards.'

,, 126, l. 5 from bottom, *for* 'intilt' *read* 'intill't.'

,, 146, l. 8 ,, ,, omit the first comma.

,, 146, l. 12 ,, ,, *for* 'drave down' *read* 'down driv'n.'

,, 183, l. 13 ,, ,, *for* 'convertable' *read* 'convertible.'

,, 185, l. 7 ,, ,, *for* 'muderer' *read* 'murderer.'

,, 188, l. 12 ,, ,, *for* 'they' *read* 'thy.'

,, 193, l. 1 ,, ,, *for* = *put* -.

,, 198, l. 2, *for* 'Sechsis' *read* 'Sechzig.'

,, 211, l. 19 from bottom, *for* 'for' *read* 'to.'

,, 231, l. 21. N.B.—The author has found that his copy of M.M.'s trans., dated 1900 on title page, is a reprint of the original edition published 1879–1884. But that does not alter the fact that W., even if during his Cambridge professorship he came across the book, had not sufficient interest then in the Upanishads to acquaint himself with them.

,, 232, l. 3, *for* 'five' *read* 'six.'

,, 300, l. 13 from bottom, *for* 'As' *read* 'When.'

,, 341, l. 1, omit the 'N.'

Index

Abbreviations, 342
acts, 126
Adam, 273, 274
adhvaryu, 15
A-diti, 65, 206
Āditya, 199
a-dvaitism, 101, 177
Æ, 259, etc.
Airyas, 6
Aken-aten, 170
Alliotta, 172
a-lipta, 240
altar, 167
Anaxagoras, 179
Angirases, 207
aṇ-i-mán, 39
án-ṛta, 207
ap, 161, 208
apām napāt, 57, 161
Āraṇyakas, 28
Arians, 242
arká, 160
Āryans, 4
Āryo-Dravidian, 20
as, 226
asceticism, 154
Assyrians, 196
ásura, 195
aśva-medha, 158
Aśva-pati, 245
Átharvan, 206
Atharvāngirasas, 206
Atharva-Veda, 17, 206
ati-sṛṣti, 176
átmán, 207. *See also* Self.
a-vy-ayam, 183
ā-yát-ana, 174

banyan-tree, 111, 180
Being, 101, 108
known in determinations, 38, 187
Out of & into, 101,107
Riddles of, 108
Bethune-Baker, 243
Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 172
bhū, 169
bhūḥ, bhuvaḥ, svaḥ, 84, 169
Bird of Paradise, 115, 182
Birdwood, xiv, 345
blisses, 122
body, 118, 128, 139
bráhman (spirit), 30, 43, 87, 89, 95, 122, 203
brahmán (Brāhmin), 218
brāhmaṇá (Brāhmin), 47, 222
bráhmaṇa (commentary), 22, 222
brahmarṣideśa, 22
Brahmāvarta, 21
brahma-vidyā, 175
breath (prāṇa), 216
Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upanishad, 218
Bṛhas-pati, 12
Bridges, Robert, 159, 163
Bunyan, 270

Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 212
child, 146
Christ, infant, 172
Coleridge, 160
Commentaries, Age of, 20
Commentary (brahmaṇa), 22, 222
Commentary of Hundred Paths, 225
consciousness, ceasing of, 135
source of, 121
Crashaw, 172
creation, 54, 77, 97, 101, 176
super-, 176
Croce, 184

Day and I, 85
death analysed, 107
described, 123
Open way at, 86
desire, 125, 127
without, 127
Deussen, x, xi
Deuteronomy, 296
devas, 195
Dionysius, 191
Docetae, 241
Dyaus, 5, 200

Eberhardt, Paul, vi, 50, 88
Editions of Upanishads—
Basu, 175
Deussen, xi
Hume, xi
Tatya, 165
elements, 101, 178
Emerson, 171
essence, aṇ-i-mán, 39
rása, 243

False in Truth's Embrace, 153, 201
Ficus Bengalensis, 110, 180
Ficus Religiosa, 183
Flesh (*nephesh*, *psychē*), 276, 327
& Spirit, 66–, 278–
Gāndhāras, 112, 181
gandharva, 211
Glasenapp, Otto von, 171, 172, 188

Gods, Decline of, 25
good & evil, Indifference to, 121, 129, 183, 185
grace of Self, 45, 156
Greek philosophy, 179

Hāla's strophes, 170
Hāri-drumata, 227
Head, Eight Wardens, 148
Heinrici, 282
Holmes, E. G. A., 168
Hopkins, E. W., 44
Horse-sacrifice explained, 158
the world as, 50, 54
hotṛ, 15
Hume, R. E., xi

Incarnation, acceptance of, 240, 242
hesitation, 239, 242
Indo-European home, 3
thought, 3
Indra, 14, 25, 209
& Virocana, 138
Infinite descriptions, 191
Irenaeus, 272
Janaka, 117, 212
Jeans, 306
Jesus, 262
Jones, Sir William, v

Kālidāsa, 188
Kant, 296
karman, 211
Kosala-Videhas, 212
krátu, 204
KU.4.1., 297
Kuru-Pancālas, 22, 212
Krishna, 172

Life, The One Perfect, 233
lingam, 189
Loerke, 171
Love, 309

Mackinstosh, H. R., 184
macrocosm & microcosm, 84, 169
Madhu, 175
Magic Ritual, Age of
Escape from, 27
man, assay of, 276
education of, 277
nature of, 274
spiritual, 122, 283
man and wife, 61, 162
mánas, 222
Manu, 175
mind in the universe, 101, 222
Muṇḍaka Upanisad, 222
name and form, 102, 177
nephesh (*psychē*), 327
Newton, 296
Nicene Creed, 242
non-dualism, 101, 177
ny-ag-rodha tree, 111, 180
oṁ, 210
One, The, 18, 301
not a blank unity, 301, 318
One, becoming, 107, 124
opposites, 184
above the, 116, 122, 183, 186
'orphan quotation,' 189

Parjanya, 198
Partridge disciples, 212
Peepul, 183
'Perfect' in O.T. & N.T., 268
Perfect Life, The One, 233
person (púruṣa), 213
the five persons, 78
identical in sun and eye, 82, 215
The World-, 31
poetry, character of the, 13
poets. Age of the, 14
pra, 82
Prajā-pati, 25, 138, 215
prāṇa, 216
psychic body, 282
puruṣa, 31, 213

rása, 243
ṛtá, 210
real, The, 108, 152
Richwood, Edgell, 162
Riddles of Uddālaka, 108
Rigveda, 21, 225
ritual, 15, 19, 23
Age of, 20
Robertson, J. S. S., ix
Rom. i. 4, 237
rūaḥ, noun, 329, 336
verb, 330
Rudra, 198
Russell, G. W., 259

sacrifice, Vedic, 19, 78
Samarkand, 7
Sāma-veda, 22, 164, 225
Śaṁkara, 173, 177
saṁ-sāra, 227
sam-udrá, 159, 208
Śāṇḍilya, 225
Creed of, 87
Sanskrit, 227
pronunciation, 49
sat, 226
Śata-patha Brāhmaṇa, 225
sat-tva, 202, 226
sat-yá, 153, 226
Satya-kāma, 89, 227
Savitṛ, 199
Schayer, 179

Secret Lore, The, 39
Self, The
beyond understanding, 136
comprehensiveness of, 87, 88, 126, 134
creative, 302, 304, 308
Day & I, 85
depths of, 287, 319
distress of, 114
dream-, 119
dreamless, 120
glory of, 40, 128, 129, 315
importance of, 133, 138
independence of, 136, 246
love, its activity, 309
love of, 132
mutuality of, 251
one & only, 119
qualities of, 246, 262
is reality, 44, 181, 301
return to itself, 77
revelation of, 45, 156
Schayer on, 179
to be seen in all things, 149, 250
sinfulness of, 254
song of, 83
supremacy of, 128
truth of, 256, 272
unborn, 128, 130
ungraspable, 129
varieties of, 139
wake & sleep, 118-120
Self, The Perfect, 256, 262, 322
sin, 254
sin-deterrent fire, 155
sleep, 118-120
Smuts, 307
Soma, 176
song of the Self, 83
sonship, 239
not lost, 279
the perfect, 262, 295
restored, 280, 322, 336
spirit-begotten, 280
spirit (bráhman), 30, 43, 82, 122
(rūaḥ), 329, 336
and the All, 33, 87, 95
with Āryans & in Bible, 328
-ual body, 67, 282
and Creation, 87, 89, 95, 97
and the Flesh, 278
-ual man, 122
and Self, 95, 97
restores, 289, 336
sṛṣṭi, 176
Supreme, The
apartness intolerable, 243
mercy of, 156, 321
nature of, 309
unity with, 300, 318
Sūrya, 199
Śvetaketu, 99, 114, 225
swastika, 174

Taittirīyas, 212
tajjalān, 87
teaching *ad hoc.*, 139, 197
regressive, 185
upanishad, 48
tejas, 37, 178
Thomas, Edith M., 169
thunder, Meaning of, 150
Tolstoi, 159
transcendent & empiric, 115, 235
transmigration, 125, 188
truth, 113, 182
embracing falsehood, 153

Uddālaka, 37, 99, 209
unity, presentiments of, 18
Upanishads, 2, 209
Classic Doctrine, 40
Index of Selections, 341
Philosophy of Being 44, 301
Selections, 50
The Thirteen, 342

Vāma-deva, 95, 175
Varisco, 187
Varuṇa, 9, 223
Véda, 224
land of origin, 6
character of, 13
vedi, 167
Videhas, 212
vi-jnāna, 224
vip, 12
Virocana, 138, 224
Vivasvant, 200
Voice, 60

waters (ap), 58, 161, 208
(salila), 122, 186
(sam-udrá), 208
Westcott, xiii, 230
on Christianity, 232
on Hindu thought, 337
Whitman, 247, etc.
Wisdom in the *Wisdom of Solomon*, 34
world, as horse-sacrifice, 50, 56
as an ox, 58, 91, 161
material, 58
psychic, 61
reality of, 44, 310
spiritual, 67, 87, 91
world beyond, 120, 131

Xenophanes, 193

Yājnavalkya, 40, 117, 131, 222
Yajur-veda, 21, 23, 163, 225
yakṣa, 30



PRINTED BY
W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD.,
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय
L B.S. National Academy of Administration, Library
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE 102147
यह पुस्तक निम्नाँकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।
This book is to be returned on the date last stamped

दिनांक Date	उधारकर्त्ता की सख्या Borrower's No.	दनांक Date	उध की संख्या Borrower's No.

294.59218
Tea

102147

अवाप्ति संख्या
ACC. No. ~~23591~~

वर्ग संख्या
Class No.

पुस्तक सं.
Book No.

लेखक
Author... Teape, W. M.

शीर्षक
Title... The secret lore of India and the one perfect life for all.

निर्गम दिनांक Date of Issue	उधारकर्ता की सं. Borrower's No.	हस्ताक्षर Signature

294.59218 ~~23591~~
Tea

LIBRARY
LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI
National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 102147

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double