

shown" (*avyakta*)¹⁸ requires as logical antecedent "beyond the shown" (*vyakta*): for it is precisely the Great, the Person in the Sun, that as the light and eye of the divine understanding is the divine manifestation of all that can be manifested (*vyakta*). What the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, then, affirms is that the uncharacterized Person is "beyond" both the shown and the unshown, transcending their distinction, not to be thought of merely as one or the other, but rather as *vyaktāvyaakta*, "shown-unshown"; and thus interpreted, the Person "beyond whom there is naught whatever" coincides in reference with the Upaniṣadic superessential Essence (*paramātman*) and the Brahman as transcending the distinction of *satasat*, being and nonbeing alike.

¹⁸ That Rawson, KU, p. 21, renders *avyakta* by "matter" shows that he has in mind the customary renderings of the Sāṃkhyan *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* by "spirit and matter." But "spirit and matter" represents an antithesis unknown to Indian thought, which rather distinguishes essence from nature or substance, or act from potentiality, in the Supreme Identity. Indian *avyakta*, like the "unshown" of pure metaphysics in general, cannot be identified with Christian "primary matter," which is a "potentiality only with respect to the reception of natural forms" (*Sum. Theol.* 1.7.2 ad 3); *avyakta* embraces all possibilities, not only those of being, but also those which are not in any sense possibilities of manifestation. This metaphysically infinite possibility (*aditi*, *mūla-prakṛti*, etc.), as being the divine nature (*svabhāva*) and the matrix (*yoni*) of the divine essence, becomes the means whereby (*śakti*, *māyā*, *svadhā*, etc.) the latter operates, the distinction of essence from nature arising simultaneously with the divine act which presupposes it.



Bhakta Aspects of the Ātman Doctrine

But when the sun has set . . . moon has set . . . fire gone out,
and speech hushed, what light does a person here have?
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad IV.3.6

A sharp distinction is often drawn between the Way of Gnosis (*jñāna-mārga*) on the one hand and the Way of Dedication (*bhakti-mārga*) or Way of Love (*prema-mārga*) on the other, this distinction corresponding at the same time to that of the Contemplative Life (*sāṃkhya yoga* and *saṃnyāsa* of BG) from the Active Life (*ṛkarma yoga* of BG). The distinction, which is made as if the operations of the intellect and will could be isolated as clearly in the subject as they can be in logic, is one in any case of procedure and, under certain conditions, also one of ends; and such a distinction is certainly not without meaning insofar as it corresponds to one of mysticism from gnosticism, that is, of devotional faith and religious exercises from initiatory teaching and metaphysical practice, of a "deification" in the sense of assimilation with a perfect consent of will from a "deification" in which the distinction of knower from known is past.

On the other hand, whatever may be the facts about the devotional works generally attributed to Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, there can be no doubt that Indians whose thought and mode of being is traditional have never found any difficulty in thinking of this greatest and most intellectual exponent of nondualistic (*advaita*) metaphysics as having been at one and the same time a *bhakta* and a *jñānī*. Consider in this connection also the markedly devotional phraseology of certain hymns included in V. P. Bhaṭṭa's *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* (J. R. Ballantyne, tr., Calcutta, 1851), where, for example, we find, addressed to the spirit (*ātman*), "Now that

[Internal evidence points only to a date after 1936 for the composition of this paper
—ED.]

I have gotten Thee, I shall never let Thee go" (*idānim tvām aham prāpto na tyajāmi ṛadācana*); it is only the academic scholar to whom such an expression of feeling on the part of a Vedantist can seem incongruous. The *Bhagavad Gītā*, v.2-4, indeed, plainly affirms that for one perfected (*āsthitaḥ samyak*) in either Way, one and the same fruition (*eḥam . . . phalam*) and *summum bonum* (*nihśreyasa*) results, nor can this *summum bonum* intended be any other than the "despiration in Brahman" (*brahma-nirvāṇam*) of BG v.24-25, *nirvāṇam* here corresponding to *anātyam* in TU II.7. BG VIII.22 is equally explicit: "That supernal Person is to be gotten by an exclusive self-dedication" (*puruṣaḥ sa paraḥ . . . bhaktyā labhyas tu ananyayā*), that is to say, by an undivided or "pure" love as defined by St. Bernard.

"Perfected" (*samyak*) in the passage just cited implies an important reservation, since it is not to be supposed that the reward (*phala*) of one who has followed either path halfway will be the same as that of one who reaches its end.¹ One who goes but halfway, whether by a move-

¹ "According as men approach me, so do I deal unto them" (BG IV.11), i.e., I give them whatever they seek, whether it be mundane welfare, or "salvation," or "liberation": "Whatever desire he has, that is bestowed upon him," i.e., by the Sun (SB 1.9.3.16). How the wayfarer's attainment is thus self-determined is admirably stated in the *Abhidharmaśāstra*, vi.45d: "Whatever desire is bound up with a given Way, cannot be eradicated by that Way"; the exoteric Christian Way, for example, cannot lead to anything but a "personal immortality," cannot lead beyond "salvation" to "liberation." No Way can be thought of as extending beyond the goal to which it is actually directed.

It may be remarked that although deliverance (*mokṣa*, *nirvāṇa*) involves a cessation (*nirodha*) of intellection (*viññāna*, *citta*, cf. *viññānassa nirodha = ceto vimutti*, D 1.223), a sharp distinction of *citta*, *mana*, *viññāna*, from *atta* is maintained: "This (*citta*, *mano*, *viññāna*) is not 'mine' this is not 'I,' this is not my Spirit (*atta*)," S II.94-95. Cf. also *mano nidoddhavyam hrāi*, MU VI.34; *ātmasamsthāmanah kṛtvā na kimcid api cintayet*, BG VI.25; and "The mind must be de-mented" (Eckhart, Evans ed., I, 243). Such a cessation can be of two sorts, (1) a state of real unconsciousness (*asamjñi*), or (2) a state of peace (*śānti*) and sameness or perfect simplicity (*samtatā*). The former is expressly described (*Abhidharmaśāstra* 42-64) as a mistaken conception of deliverance (*nihśarana*) entertained by certain of the profane (*prthagjana*), who may indeed attain to such a condition, but will reawaken to contingent being (cf. Īśā Up. 12, where those who are attached to an ideal of non-entity, *asambhūta*, go to realms of darkness no less than those who are attached to the concept of entity, *sambhūta*); while others of the profane shrink from the idea of "deliverance" just because they understand that by deliverance is meant "annihilation." The quoted passages and whole context show that it is not a destruction of the intellect that is implied by *amanibhāva*, but rather that when the intellect no longer intelligizes, i.e., when there is no longer any distinction of knower and known, of being and knowledge, but only knowledge as being and being as knowledge (in our text, *yet cittas tan mayo bhavati*), "One is what he thinks" and is no longer one who

ment of the will as in mysticism, or by means of an intellectual contemplation as in theology, guided only by "faith," may indeed attain to the highest level of contingent human being and to the vision of the Face of God, but has not yet reached the Supreme Identity (*tad eḥam*), and is still in multiplicity.

The Christ as such, as a Person, is not the final goal, but rather the Path itself.² The Christ is the Axis of the Universe, Agni "columnar [*śkambhaḥ = σταυρός*] in the nest of proximate life,³ standing in His ground at the parting of the ways" (*pathām visarge*, RV x.5.6), the Sun (*savitā satyadharmendraḥ*) to Whom all paths converge (*samare pathīnam*, VS XII.66), and by the same token the Gate of the World, the way out into time and way back into eternity. "I am the door, by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture. . . .⁴ I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh to the Father but by Me" (John 10:9 and 14:6). Similarly, in the Vedic tradition the supernal Sun, the "Truth" (*satyam*), is the Portal of the Universe and Heaven's only Opening (Cleft, *loka-dvāra*, *divās-chidra*), as it were the "Hub of the Chariot Wheel" (*rathasya kha*) passing through which (*ādityam samaye*, "through the midst of the Sun") the Comprehensor (*vidvān*) is "wholly liberated" (*atimucyate*) (JUB 1.3, 5, and III.33, CU VIII.6.5, Īśā Up. 15, 16, etc.). "There is no approach by a side path here in the world" (MU VI.30).⁵

thinks of anything; that is Gnosis. Cf. Indra in CU VIII.11, with Kauṣ. Up. IV.20 and Eckhart's, "What the tyro fears is the expert's delight; the kingdom of God is for none but the thoroughly dead" (Evans ed., I, 419). On the other hand, by a demutation in the second sense is implied that form of beatitude to which the Transmundane or Aryan Path is ordered; cf. BG II.71, "The man who rejects all desires and proceeds apart, absolved from 'I and mine,' he reaches Peace" (*śāntim gacchati*), and BG VI.15, *śāntim nirvāṇam āparamām matsamsthām adhi-gacchati; matsamsthām = āmasamsthām*, cf. BG x.20, *ahamātma*).

² See Coomaraswamy, *A New Approach to the Vedas*, 1933, p. 43.

³ "Nest," the sacrificial fire-altar; the seat of the Sacrifice accomplished in the beginning and perpetuated in the ritual. "Columnar": Vedic *śkambha*, coincident with the trunk of the Tree of Life and axle-tree of the Chariot of Light, corresponds to the Gnostic *σταυρός* by which Heaven and Earth are at the same time parted and connected, and to the vertical of the Cross as well as (in the present connection especially) to the Pillar of Fire by night and Pillar of Smoke by day.

⁴ "Shall . . . pasture," as in CU VIII.5.4; when the knowers of the Spirit are possessed of the Brahma world, it is said that "theirs is a movement at will in every world" (*sarvesu lokeṣu kṛmacārah*), i.e., independent of local motion; cf. TU III.10.5, etc., quoted in Coomaraswamy, *A New Approach to the Vedas*, p. 113.

⁵ There is an apparent contradiction in SB XI.4.1, where six "doors" of access to Brahman are described. But of these, the first five lead only to an acquisition of great possessions; it is only by means of what is "perfect in the Sacrifice" (*yajñasya sam-*

The "Cleft" or "Hub" is enveloped by Rays of Light (*raśmibhis samchannam drsyate*, JUB 1.3), which must be withdrawn before the Orb (*maṇḍala*) can be clearly seen (Īśā Up. 16 *vyūha raśmīn*, JUB 1.6 *raśmīn . . . vyūha-*

pannam) that the sacrificer "enters the Sundoor of Brahman" (*āditya ha sa brahmano dvārena pratipadyate*) and becomes a "Fellow of the World of Heavenly-light (*svargalokaḥ*)"; cf. BG VII.22, 23. The foregoing is one of many passages in which it is clear that *svarga* does not necessarily mean an inferior heaven on the hither side of the Sun, but may denote the Empyrean.

In Kauṣ. Up. 1.2, it is the Moon that is the Door of the World of Heavenly-light which admits some and returns others. The question is evidently put, "Who art thou?" but the abbreviated text has only, according to various readings, either (1) "One who answers Him, obtains Him completely" (*tam yah pratyāha tam atisrjate*), taking *atisrj* as in KU 1.11 (cf. *srj* in the sense "receive" [interest] in Manu VIII.140, and *atisrjti* in BU 1.4.6), or (2) with the same reading, "One who answers Him, him He sets free," taking *tām atisrjate* as repeated at the end of Kauṣ. Up. 1.2, probably with the Moon as subject, or (3) "One who answers Him, saying 'Thou,' He liberates" (*tam yah pratyāha tvam iti srjate*), where we adopt the variant *iti srjate* and make the emendation obviously needed in this case, of *tvam* for *tam*. In any case translators, ignoring the parallel with JUB III.14 and JB 1.18, have missed the point. "But one who does not answer thus" (*ya enam na pratyāha*), or much less plausibly "does not answer" (*atha yo na pratyāha*), "descends with the rains to birth in this world as animal or person (*puruṣa*) according to his works and his wisdom" (*pratyāyate yathā karma yathā vidyam*, cf. AĀ 11.3.2, *yathā prajñam hi sambhavaḥ*; the list of animals in Kauṣ. Up. corresponds to *itaresam paiūnām* in AĀ, and is to be taken in a purely symbolic sense, distinction being made of animal men from those *puruṣaḥ* in whom the form of Humanity is actually realized). Kauṣ. Up. now twice cites the question assumed above, "Who art thou?" (*ko'si*), and to this two answers are given: (1) one which is evidently that of the man destined to be reborn includes the words, addressed to the Seasons (who in JUB III.14, "drag him away caught by the foot on the verge of success"), "Send ye me forth in man as a doer (*mā pumsī kartary irayadhvam*), through a man as agent inseminate me in a mother," this answer being appropriate for those of whom it is said that they who go to the Moon in the dark fortnight "He makes to be born" (*prajanayanti*); and (2) "I am Thou" (*tvam asmīti*), corresponding to the *tvam iti* assumed above, and appropriate to the Comprehensor who actually makes this answer (*enam . . . pratyāha*), as cited above, and accordingly "obtains the Moon," or "whom the Moon sets free (*tam atisrjate*)." The Path is often formulated as leading to the Sun, thence to the Moon, and thence into the Lightning (e.g., CU IV.11-12 and V.10.2) or Fire (MU VI.38), i.e., Agni Vaidyuta, the Lightning; notwithstanding that the Sun and Moon are Heaven and Earth, *om* and *Vāc*, the world of the divinities and world of men respectively (JUB III.13 and BU III.8.9). It is explained in MU VI.38 that "in the midst of the Sun is the Moon, in the midst of the Moon, Fire," and in any case it must be remembered that unification of the Sun and Moon is a concomitant of death (*candramā ivāditya drsyate*, AĀ III.2.4). There must be borne in mind the "*Liebesgeschichte des Himmels*": it is a constant theme throughout our sources that the Sun and Moon, Heaven and Earth, were "once" united, are separated in the beginning when time and space come into being, and are reunited at the End of the Worlds, End of the Heaven, End of the Year, where Heaven and

tī;⁶ cf. BU V.5.2, where it is a prognostication of death when "he sees that orb quite clear, those rays no longer reach him," *śuddham evaitan maṇḍalam paśyati nainam ete raśmayah pratyāyayanti*.⁷ One sees the "Golden Disk" (*hiranya patra*, Īśā Up. xv) that is represented in the cosmic rite by a golden disk (*rukma*), which is analogically the Sun (*āditya*), the Truth (*satya*), and is provided with twenty-one peripheral knobs, which represent the solar Rays extended to the thrice seven "worlds" (ŚB III, and *passim*). The Golden Disk, the Orb itself, is an operculum by which the Mouth or Inlet (*mukha*, Īśā Up. 15, JUB III.33.8, cf. BG XI.25, *mukhāni*, cf.

Earth embrace; cf. *Zohar, Shelah Lecha* section: "When the light of the Sun arrives, the Moon is embraced in it; but the Sun and Moon cannot shine together; the Moon cannot shine till the Sun is gathered in." When the Sun and Moon are unified, the worlds are as it were closed up, the "middle space" (*antarikṣa, rajas*) is closed up; for one who sees them thus there is no more place for any "world." And so it is said that one "climbs the Tree, conjoining these two Divinities pairwise" (*ete dve devate samdhāye*, JUB 1.3.2), and it is indeed at the Treetop that "the Eagle-pair of conjoint lovers are embraced together" (*dvā suparnā sayujā saḥhāyā samānam vrkṣam pari svajāte*, RV 1.164.20; cf. VS XXXVIII.25 and TS VII.4.19p), who are at once the Sun and Moon, Mitra and Varuṇa, Heaven and Earth, and as in BU IV.3.19 and 21, the Spirit of God and self-same Spirit in Man (*prajñenātmanā sampariṣvaktāḥ, ibid.*), which Foreknowing Spirit, even though embodied Itself, is bodiless and consubstantial with the Sun (*yas cāyam āsarirah prajñātmā yas cāsav āditya eḥam*, AĀ III.2.3 and 4 which, as remarked by Keith, is "the most common doctrine in the Upanishads").

⁶ Misunderstood alike by Oertel ("parts his rays") and by Hume ("Spread forth thy rays"). Sāyaṇa's *vyūha* = *vigamaya* is correct; *vyūh* is here indeed to "scatter," but in the sense "dispel," "remove," "withdraw."

The formulation in AĀ III.2.4 is foolproof: "The Sun's rays are no longer manifest" (*na rasmayah prādūr bhavanti*). The Sun's rays are extended and withdrawn in accordance with the "spider" symbolism explained in Coomaraswamy, "Angel and Titan," 1935.

⁷ The Rays are often spoken of as the "feet" of the Sun, who is thus (1) *ekapāda* with respect to the single Life-ray by which each being is immediately connected with him, and which is that individual's "Way" (*devapatha*), and in the case of the Eternal Avatar as manifested at the Navel of the Earth (*nābhīr pṛthivīyā*) is the *śkambha*, or Axis of the Universe; and (2) *sahasrapāda* if we consider all the Rays that reach all beings severally. That those Rays "no longer reach him" who is dying can then be otherwise expressed by saying that the feet of Death, the person in the solar Orb, which during life are "deeply planted in the heart" (*hṛdaye padau atihatau āditasya raśmaya . . . nādiṣu srptā*, sc. *hṛdayasya*, CU VIII.6.2), are cut off, and when He thus departs, the person dies (ŚB X.5.2.13); cf. AĀ III.2.4, where it is a sign of death when the rays of the Sun are no longer seen (*na raśmayah prādūr bhavanti*). He then who could not gaze upon the sun in life but only sees his rays (speaking now in terms of the physical analogy), at death no longer sees the rays, but only the well-defined orb.

anīka)⁸ is covered up (*apihitam*).⁹ That is, the Intelligible Truth conceals what God is in Himself, "The Immortal veiled by Truth": the Immortal, i.e., Spiration (*prāṇa* = *ātman*); Truth, i.e., Form and Aspect (*nāmarūpa*) in Him as forms or ideas or eternal reasons or "hidden names" (*nāmāni guhyāni*), which are ontologically speaking the causes of the being of things as they are in themselves. In this there is no contradiction, inasmuch as the knowledge of God by which He "creates" cannot be distinguished from His essence; "It knew only Itself, that 'I am Brahman,' thereby It became the All," BU 1.4.9-10. We are thus brought back to the ultimate problem of "distinction in identity," and it would appear that "things as they are in God," in their "own form" which is also His form, are at the same time "themselves" as being capable of a distinct manifestation and of specific pleasures (TU III.10.5, like John 10:9, and in our text cited here), although this is neither a local motion nor a physical experience, since "He circles there (*sa tara paryēti*) taking his pleasure (*ramamaṇah*), regardless of any appended body to which the breath of Life (*prāṇa*) may be yoked," and "When He, the Spirit, proposes to be aware of this or that, Intellect (*manas*) is His Divine Eye, it is therewith that He recognizes and takes his pleasure in loves" (*kāmān apaśyan ramate*), CU VIII.12, 3 and 5). "To know God as He is, we must be absolutely free from knowledge" (Meister Eckhart, Evans ed., I, 365), that is, from any "knowledge-of" Him, any theodicy whatever. Accordingly, the Comprehensor prays, or rather being himself of a like nature with the Sun, demands of the Sun to "gather in His brilliance" (*samūha tejo*), that is, to contract it to a central point without dimension, "That I may see Thy fairest form" (*rūpam kalyāṇatamam*), and exclaims triumphantly, "He that is yonder, yonder Person in the Sun, That am I," Īsā Up. 15, 16.

This Person in the Sun, who is in fact the "Truth of Truth" (*satya-sya satyam*), is otherwise called Death (*mṛtyu*, sometimes *yama*): "Death is the Person in the Orb (*mandale*); the Light that shines (*arcir dīpyate*)

⁸ Literally "mouth," but here, as commonly also in architectural terminology, "way in," just as we say "mouth of a tunnel." This is, of course, like the "door" of John 10:9, both a way in and a way out, and in the latter sense the "gateway of his emanation." What the Comprehensor seeks is to be swallowed up. *Mukha* is also "face," (Meister Eckhart, Evans ed., I, 364), "His countenance whereto He admits no creature and whereinto no creature can get," without, that is, abandoning its creaturehood.

⁹ TU 1.4.1 addressed to the omniform (*viśvarūpa*) Indra (as the Sun): "Thou art the sheath (*hośa*) of Brahman, shut in by wisdom (*medhayā apihitam*)." Also cf. *brahmāvarta* as the land of the Devas, Manu 11.17. The distinction of *āvarta* from *patha* is doubtless intentional; *āvarta* also implies *samsarāna*.

is what does not die (*amṛtam*). Accordingly, Death does not die, forasmuch as He is within (*na mriyate hy antah*), nor is He seen (*na drīyate*), being within what does not die" (ŚB x.5.2.3), viz. the Light of the Unconquerable Sun, who really "neither rises nor sets, but only inverts Himself" (AB III.44). It is precisely with this Death, Privation (*mṛtyu*, *aśanāya*) that the Comprehensor is unified, and so forever escapes contingent death (BU 1.2.7), though He dogs the Wayfarer's steps until he reaches the Treetop and escapes through the midst of the Sun (JUB 1.3).

What lies beyond, within, is a "Divine Darkness," blinding to all human faculties by its excess of light, and "hidden from all knowledge" (Dionysius, *Epist. ad Caium monachum*; cf. Vedic *guhā nihitam*, etc.), the "Darkness where God was" of Exodus 20:21, "the City [that] had no need of the Sun, neither of the Moon, to shine in it" (Rev. 21:23 ff.); "There the Sun does not shine" (KU v.15, Muṇḍ. Up. 11.2.10, etc.), "neither Sun, nor Moon, nor Fire" (BG xv.6). "What the soul grasps in the light, she loses in the darkness. Yet she makes for the cloud, deeming His darkness better than her light" (Meister Eckhart, Evans ed., I, 364).

Here in the empyrean (*parama vyoman*, *brahma-loka*, etc.), corresponding to the "third Heaven" of St. Paul, "there is no more any guidance robed in human likeness (*puruṣo'mānavah*)¹⁰ *sa enam brahma gamayateṣa devapatho brahmapathah*), nor do those who enter there any more return to this human wayfaring" (*etena pratipadyamānā imam mānavam āvartam navārtante*), CU IV.15.5-6, cf. v.10.2; *paramām gatim, yam prāpya na nivartante*, BG VIII.21.

The interior and exterior operations, respectively hidden and revealed (*guhya*, *āvis*), infinite and finite (*aditi*, *diti*), inexplicit and explicit (*anirukta*, *nirukta*, etc.), are divided by an opaque screen¹¹ ("veiled by my Māyā," BG), penetrable (*nirvedhya*) only through the Sun. Divinity, if we think of it objectively as far away, is there beyond, or if we think of it as very near is here within us (*antarbhūtasya kṛc, hrdayākṣē guhā nihitam*, etc.). But these two natures, of God as He is in Himself, and as He is in us, are really one, and as explained in JUB III.33 (and less clearly in AĀ II.1.5), he only really attains to the Persons who know them both ways, as transcendent and as immanent (*adhidevatam, adhyātman*)

¹⁰ Cf. Muṇḍ. Up. 11.1.2 *puruṣah . . . aprāno hy amānāh*; in JB 1.50, *na manuṣyah = devānām ekaḥ*; cf. BU 1.2.7 = Agni Vaidyuta, the Lightning, and see Kena Up. 29.

¹¹ Islamic "murity" (*jidāriyyā*); Eckhart's "boundary line between united and separated creatures" (Meister Eckhart, Evans ed., I, 464).

in identity (*eḱadhā*); "he knows the Spirit (or very self), he knows Brahman, the Gate or Face (cf. *anika*) accepts him, he getteth all and overcometh all, his every desire is fulfilled" (*sa ātmānam veda, sa brahma veda . . . mukha ādhatte*,¹² *tasya sarvam āptam bhavati, sarvam jitam; na hāsya kścana kāmō'nāpto bhavati*; cf. BU IV.3.21). And whereby or wherein these Persons "become one" (*eḱam bhavanti*) is called a "super-human wayfaring" (*brahmana āvarta*), evidently identical with the *devapatha* or *brahmapatha* of CU IV.15.6¹³ and *devayāna* of Kauṣ. Up. I.3.¹⁴ In the same way, in AV XIII.4.20, "All the Devas become simplex in Him" (*eḱavṛto bhavanti*), and similarly in AĀ II.3.8 (*eḱam bhavanti*), and AĀ V.12, where a "becoming onefold" is equated with "attainment of the highest" (*eḱadhā bhūyam bhūtvā paramatām gacchataḥ*). Such a "becoming one" implies a "dying to oneself" (*suam et proprium = aham ca mama*, cf. MU VI.17), and in fact "to be unified" acquires the specific meaning "to die" (they say of the dying man in BU IV.4.2, *eḱi bhavati*), in the same way that to effect the unification of any creature is to "kill" (AĀ III.2.3, where the Year is said to "separate some things and unify

¹² The whole passage reads *sa yo ha eva vidvān prānena prānya apānena apānya manasā, etā ubhayir devatā ātmany etya, mukha adhatte*, etc. (the arrangement as a *pada* text and the punctuation are mine). Oertel's rendering (JAOS, XVI, 1894, 193) is imperfect: the conspiracy, or return of the breath of life (*prāna, spiraculum vitae*) to its source is to be effected "intellectually" (*manasā*), cf. KU IV.11, "This is only to be gotten intellectually" (*manasaivedam āptavyam*); *i* takes the accusative of the goal, and this is "these divinities under both aspects" (*eta ubhayir devatā*), *ātmani* being "in the Spirit"; cf. Rev. 4:2, "immediately I was in the Spirit, and behold," etc. *Mukha*, as in Iśā Up. 15, is the Sun or Face of God, hidden from human vision by the "golden disk" of manifested Truth (*satyam*); Oertel translates as if the reading were *mukhe*. That the manifested truth is in the last analysis a veil explains the designation of the "nonproceeding" or "inexhaustible" (*aḱṣara*) Brahman within as the "Truth of Truth" (*satyasya satyam*, AĀ II.3.8 = *veritas veritatis*).

¹³ Merely to pass through the Sun is not then forthwith to have reached that end in which all progress ends: as pointed out by Sāyana, there is still to be accomplished that union which is implied by the words "being Brahman one attains to Brahman." The stations of the unseen path that leads beyond the "Door of the world of Heavenly-light, to the throne of Brahmā," (Kauṣ. Up. 1.3) are described symbolically.

¹⁴ *Devapatha*, in BU V.5.2 *devayānaḥ pathaḥ*; cf. Kauṣ. Up. 1.3, "Having entered upon this *devayāna* he comes . . . to the Brahma world." The "two paths" are those of RV X.88.15, repeated in BU VI.2.2. The *devapatha* is also the same as the *sāmapatha* of JUB 1.6. These two paths are further analyzed in BG VII.23-27 (distinction of yogis who are "returners" and "Nonreturners." Also in AĀ II.1.5, *etaddha tat* corresponds to *aḱadhā bhavanti*). The same idea is expressed in JUB 1.3 in a simpler form; here one ascends the worlds "uniting these divinities pairwise" (Sun and Moon, etc.).

[*aikyā bhāvayan*] others," i.e., to bring into being some and to bring about the death of others).¹⁵

Two Ways or Cycles (*āvarta*)¹⁶ are thus distinguished, a "human" and a "superhuman" Way, *manavārta* and *brahmapatha*, one of return (*pitṛyāna*) and one of nonreturn (*devayāna*); corresponding exactly to what is called in Mahāyāna Buddhism¹⁷ respectively, the "Mundane" or "Taught" (*laukika, saikṣa*) and "Transmundane," "Untaught," "Pure," or "Aryan" (*loḱottara, aśaikṣa*,¹⁸ *anāsrava, ārya*) Paths, of which the former leads the Wayfarer to the "Summit of Contingent Being" (*bhavāgra*), which is the highest ground attainable by a Bodhisattva as such, whence he proceeds by the latter to omniscience and Buddhahood. It is not to be inferred that having reached the Summit of Contingent Being one there abandons the Mundane and enters the Transmundane Path. On the contrary, although the Mundane Path alone is available in the lowest of the "Three Worlds," or rather "States of Contingent Being" (*kāmadhātu, rūpadhātu, ārūpyadhātu*), beyond this level of reference the Paths run side by side, but end at different points—"Only the Transmundane or Aryan Path can destroy the passions that remain at the Summit of Contingent Being" (*Abhidharmaśāstra* VI.47). Nor must the "Worlds," although the sphere of transmigration, be conceived of only in a spatial or temporal sense (the *Ārūpyadhātu* in particular is "placeless," *asthāna*); they are rather, at least in the present connection, states of being by which the whole of time and space are permeated, and are distinguishable somewhat as one distinguishes the "Life of Pleasure" from the "Active Life" and "Contemplative Life," or the "Householder's" from the "Homeless" life. The Buddha, for example, is considered to have attained the *bhavāgra* when he took his seat beneath the Tree, and to have attained to omniscient Buddhahood then and there, in virtue of the Aryan Path that had been previously trodden.

These two sharply distinguished Paths correspond, on the one hand, to the exoteric, religious, and passively mystical means of approach to

¹⁵ As also formulated in MU VI.15, "From the Year indeed are they engendered . . . and in the Year they go home" (*astam yanti*, "go to their rest," "die").

¹⁶ *āvarta* is "Way" in the sense of course or cycle, or even eddy, with an implication of turning or spiral motion; both the centrifugal and centripetal motions of consciousness with respect to its center are, in fact, of this sort; cf. René Guénon, "La Double Spirale," *Études traditionnelles*, XLI (1936).

¹⁷ *Abhidharmaśāstra*, II.12 and 42-44, VI.45, 47, etc., VIII.5, etc. (see the summarized account of the Way, Poussin ed., Vol. IV, *avant-propos*).

¹⁸ Cf. Kena Up. 1.3, *yathāitad anuśiṣyāt*, "How would one teach it?"

God and, on the other, to the esoteric, initiatory, and metaphysical means of access to the Supreme Identity. But it would be begging the question to assume that they are to be identified with mutually exclusive paths of dedication (*bhakti*) and of Gnosis (*jñāna*); the question is rather whether these two Paths are not inseparably connected, if not in their beginning then in any case in their development. Can we imagine a perfected ardor apart from understanding, or a perfected understanding without ardor? Can any qualitative distinction be drawn between a consummated union of lover and beloved and a consummated union of knower and known? It is precisely a consideration of the *ātman* doctrine that may lead us to a conclusion in agreement with the negative answer that had already been foreshadowed. It is not by any means to be supposed that such a negative answer implies that there can be any transcendence of or liberation from human substantiality, both physical and psychic, apart from initiation (*dikṣā*) and gnosis (*jñāna*); what is implied is, rather, that a perfected Gnosis necessarily involves a Beatification (*anirdeśyam paramam sukham*, KU v.14; *paramo hy eṣa ānandaḥ*, ŚB x.5.2.11; *sukham uttamam upaiti . . . brahmabhūtam*, BG vi.27; Dante's *piacere eterno*, Paradiso, xviii.16).

The *bhavāgra* may be more fully explained. Broadly speaking, this "Summit of Contingent Being" corresponds to the Christian concept of Heaven, where there is a direct vision of God, but by no means necessarily a "mystic union." But, as Eckhart expresses it, "As this is not the summit of divine union, so it is not the soul's abiding place" (Evans ed., I, 276), and this is in perfect agreement with the words of SP v.74, "That is a resting-place (*viśrāma*), not an involution" (*nivṛti*)—not, that is, what Eckhart means by the "Drowning."

Those who reach the Summit of Contingent Being are, strictly speaking, "saved," since their essence (*ātmabhāva*,¹⁹ individual substance considered as a "naturing of the Spirit" or as a "state of selfhood") is indestructible (*Abhidharmaśāstra* II.45B), though they may or may not be re-born when their term of being on the plane is completed, those who still have "connections" (*saṃyojanāni*) being "returners" and those who have not, "Nonreturners." A Bodhisattva, for example, "returns" to the lower worlds of contingent being, being drawn thereunto by the force of his messianic vows, while a Buddha does not return at the end of time, but is "wholly despirated" (*parinivṛta*).

¹⁹ *Bhūtātman* as distinct logically but not really from *ātman* in MU II.7 and III.1.

The Summit of Contingent Being corresponds to the station otherwise called the "Treetop" (*vrkṣāgra*): "Those who ascend to the Top of the Great Tree, how do they fare thereafter? Those who have wings fly away, those without wings fall down" (JUB III.13). The latter correspond to the "fallen from *yoga*" (*yogabraṣṭaḥ*) of BG vi.41 ff., i.e., those whose vision of the Truth is obscured by an imperfect fixation (stabilization) of the Intellect in *yoga* (*yogāc calita mānasaḥ*) by which they have fallen short of perfection (*samsiddham*); consider in Buddhism the six kinds of *Arhats*, of whom only the "Immovable" (*akūpya-dharman*) cannot fall, while the deliverance of the others is temporal (*Abhidharmaśāstra* vi.56 ff.), a "going and coming" as in BG ix.21.