

Guénon expresses it, "toute science apparaissait ainsi comme un prolongement de la doctrine traditionnelle elle-même, comme une de ses applications . . . une connaissance inférieure si l'on veut, mais pourtant encore une véritable connaissance," while, *per contra*, "Les fausses synthèses, qui s'efforcent de tirer le supérieur de l'inférieur . . . ne peuvent jamais être qu'hypothétiques. . . . En somme, la science, en méconnaissant les principes et en refusant de s'y rattacher, se prive à la fois de la plus haute garantie qu'elle puisse recevoir et de la plus sûre direction qui puisse lui être donnée . . . elle devient douteuse et chancelante . . . ce sont là des caractères généraux de la pensée proprement moderne; voilà à quel degré d'abaissement intellectuel en est arrivé l'Occident, depuis qu'il est sorti des voies qui sont normales au reste de l'humanité."²³

²³ René Guénon, *Orient et Occident* (Paris, 1930), extracts from ch. 2.



The Tantric Doctrine of Divine Biunity

"You say, then, Trismegistus, that God is of both sexes?"
Hermes, *Asclepius* III.21

All tradition speaks in the last analysis of God as an innumerable and perfectly simple Identity, but also of this Supreme Identity as an identity of two contrasted principles, distinguishable in all composite things, but coincident without composition in the One who is no thing. The Identity is of Essence and Nature, Being and Nonbeing, God and Godhead—as it were, masculine and feminine. *Natura naturans, Creatrix universalis est Deus*.¹ On the other hand, a division of Essence from Nature, Heaven from Earth, subject from object, is a *sine qua non* of the existence of composite things, all of which are, but in different and particular ways. Nature then "recedes from likeness to God, yet even insofar as it has being in this wise, it retains a certain likeness to the divine being" (*Sum. Theol.* I.14.11 ad 3). Henceforth Essence is the Creator and active power, Nature the means of creation and passive recipient of form—"Nature as being that by which the generator generates" (Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* I.18). Of which the relation of man to woman is a likeness: the relation of marriage is a sacrament and rite because an adequate symbol and reflection of the identification of Essence and Nature *in divinis*.

The notion of a bisexual polarity in Deity suggested above has sometimes been regarded as a peculiarity of the mediaeval Hindu and Buddhist

[First published in French in *Études traditionnelles*, XLII (1937), this essay later appeared in its original English version in the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, XIX (1938).—ED.]

¹ *Sum. Theol.*, Turin edition, 1932 ("*nihil obstat*"), *Lexikon* by J. M. Mellinio, p. 22^b: cf. references to the text, J. M. Mellinio, *Index Rerum*, s.v. *Natura*, item 7, *natura dicitur dupliciter*, etc. Throughout the present article, "Nature" stands for *Natura naturans*.

Tantric systems of India, in which it is so clearly enunciated and made the basis of a visual and ritual symbolism:² and especially so regarded by those who disparage the use of any sexual symbolism and are therefore unwilling to recognize it elsewhere. Within the limits of the present article it would be impossible to demonstrate the veritable universality of the doctrine of a divine biunity; we shall not, for example, attempt to discuss the Chinese *yin* and *yang*, and shall merely allude to the Gnostic syzygies. What we propose to show as briefly as possible is that a symbolism of this sort permeates not only the older Indian tradition, of which the later Tantrism is, in fact, a perfectly orthodox adaptation, but also the Christian ontology from first to last.

In the Vedic tradition, the Supreme Identity (*tad ekaṃ*) is "at the same time spirant and despirated" (*ānīt avātam*, RV x.129.2), "Being and Nonbeing" (*sad-asat*) in the uttermost Empyrean, in the womb of the Infinite" (RV x.5.7). In the same way in Muṇḍ. Up. 11.2.1-2, the supralogical Brahman is "Being and Nonbeing . . . Intellect and Voice" (*sad-asat . . . vāg-manas*). The coincidence of the proximate and ultimate (*apara* and *para*) Brahman in the Upaniṣads is that of Mitrā-varuṇau in the Vedas. The Supreme Identity is equally bipolar whether one thinks of "It" as masculine or feminine: so one asks with respect to the Magna Mater, Natura Naturans Creatrix, the Infinite (*virāj, aditi*), "Who knoweth Her progenitive duality?" (*mithunatvam*, AV viii.9.10); and conversely, "He (Brahman) is a womb" (*yoniś ca giyate*, VS 1.4.7.27). But if the conjoint principles are considered in their reciprocity, it is the manifested God that is the masculine and unmanifested Godhead that is the feminine power, as being the inexhaustible reservoir of all possibility, including that of manifestation: it is, then, Mitra that inseminates Varuṇa (PB xxv.10.10), Krishna who "deposits the embryo in the Great Brahman, my womb . . . mine ultimate Nature (*para prakṛti*), the womb of all existence" (BG xiv.3 and vii.5, 6), and "Into the womb of the In-

² To what extent "Tantrism" and "Śāktism" are to be identified has been discussed by Glasenapp in *OZ*, XII (1936), 120-133, where it is concluded that "a starting point for the Śākta doctrines is given in the philosophy of 'Speech' (*vāc*) of the Mantra-Śāstras." See also the same author's "Die Entstehung des Vajrayāna," *ZDMG*, XC (1936), 546-572; Mircea Eliade, *Yoga: Essai sur les origines de la mystique indienne*, Paris and Bucharest, 1936; S. K. Das, *Śakti or Divine Power*, Calcutta, 1934; Coomaraswamy, "Parāvṛtti = Transformation, Regeneration, Anagogy," 1933, and "A Note on the Aśvamedha," 1936.

³ "Nonbeing" must not be understood to mean a nothingness: Nonbeing is predicated of the Infinite *qua* "non-Ens," not *quia* "non Est"; i.e., negatively, but not by way of privation. Cf. G. de Mengel, "La Notion de l'absolu dans diverses formes de la tradition," *Le Voile d'Isis* (June 1929).

finite that Soma puts the embryo" (RV ix.74.5), in accordance with RV x.121.7, "Waters wherein was laid the universal embryo," namely, the "Golden Germ," Hiranyagarbha.

Intellect and Voice (*manas* and *vāc*) are One *ab intra*: "The Voice is verily Brahman in the uttermost Empyrean" (TS vii.18e). But "This Brahman is Silence" (Śaṅkarācārya on VS iii.2.17). Just as the incantation (*brahman*) is there inaudibly the Brahman, so is the Voice unvoiced; the Intellect is there "de-mented" of itself, the Voice unuttered.⁴ It is only when these two are divided, when heaven and earth are pillared apart by the axis of the universe (*śkambha, σταυρός*), that Intellect and Voice become the "poles of the Vedas" (*vedasya ānī, AĀ 11.7*), respectively celestial and chthonic, then only that Being and Nonbeing take on an ethical qualification as of Life and Death, Good and Evil, divided from one another as the hither from the farther shore by the width of the universe: it is from a position here below that one prays, "Lead us from Nonbeing to Being, Darkness to Light" (BU 1.3.28). Nonbeing then acquires, indeed, the value *non Est*, inasmuch as it refers to all things under the Sun, of which Augustine says that as compared to God "nec pulchra sunt nec bona sunt nec sunt" (*Confessions* xi.4):⁵ the creation and cosmic crucifixion are not merely the necessary means of redemption, but also the very antithesis of the last end, which must be the same as the first beginning. Accordingly, as RV x.24.5 expresses it, "When the conjoint pair were parted, the Devas moaned, and cried 'Let them be wed again';" and hence the enactment of the marriage in ritual, symbolic of the reunion of Indra and Indrāṇī in the heart, so poignantly described in the analogy of human union in ŚB x.5.2.11-15.

Let us consider now one of the many texts describing the divine procession from interior to exterior operation. In PB vii.6.1-6, "Prajāpati,"⁶

⁴ RV x.27.1, "Beyond this here, assuredly, there is another sound" (*śrava id ena paro anyad asti*); Plotinus, *Enneads* 1.6.3, "Harmonies unheard create the harmonies we hear and wake the soul to the one essence in another nature"—which is the essential function alike of the Vedic and Christian liturgies.

See also MU vi.34, "The mind must be brought to a stop (*mano nirddhavyam*)," with many parallels, Brahmanical and Buddhist; and Meister Eckhart, "The mind must be de-mented. . . None may attain be he not stripped of all mental matter."

⁵ Augustine continues, making a distinction of two kinds of knowledge, empirical and absolute, analogous to the Indian *avidyā* and *vidyā*—"Scientia nostra scientiae tuae comparata ignorantia est." For the unreality of things as they are in themselves, cf. *Acts of Peter* xxxix, "there is naught else that is save Thee only."

⁶ The implications of the name "Prajāpati" and of the designation of "creatures" as *prajā*, literally "progeny," are the same as those of Acts 17:28, "We are the offspring of God."

being One and desiring to be Many, with Intellect looked upon the Silence: what was in Intellect, became the 'Great.' He perceived, 'This embryo of Myself is hidden within Me: I shall bring it to birth by means of the Voice.'⁷ He separated off the Voice: She went the way of the Vehicle of Passing-over, so-called because it swiftly 'bringeth over.' Thence the 'Great' was duly born: of which Prajāpati spake that 'This is the greatness of the Great, that it was so long a time within.' The 'Great' was unto Prajāpati even as his eldest Son."

The Son is thus already in the undivided unity of the conjoint principles the Father's image in himself, *per verbum in intellectu conceptum*;⁸ and this conception is Eckhart's "act of fecundation latent in eternity." Prajāpati's "contemplation of the Silence" is unmistakably a vital operation: the wording *tūṣṇīm manasā dhyāyat* closely corresponds to that of RV x.71.2, *manasā vācam akṛata*, "had intercourse by Intellect with the Voice," and ŚB vi.1.2.9, *sa manasaiva vācam mithunam samabhavat, sa garbhy abhavat*, "He had intercourse by Intellect with Voice, He became pregnant." That Prajāpati divides the Voice from himself (which Voice had been his "Silence"), *vācam vyasṛjata*, corresponds to BU vi.4.2, "He separated the Woman," *striyam asṛjata*—"This Voice is indeed a maiden," *yoṣā vā'yam vāḥ*, ŚB iii.2.1.19—and to St. Augustine's "I made myself a Mother of whom to be born" (*Contra V Haereses* 5). It is precisely because the Father *himself* takes birth through the Mother that there is a

⁷ "What was engendered had been life in Him" (John 1:4, from the Greek and according to the traditional punctuation). That the Vulgate renders *ō yéyove* by *quod factum est* abstracts from the original meaning the sense of vital operation. Notwithstanding that to generate and to make are the same *in divinis*, the words themselves are not synonymous, inasmuch as they consider the same thing under different aspects. The Latin version suggests what de Gaigneron has called an effort to "dénaturer," pour ne pas scandaliser." The Nicæan Council, however, maintained that the Son was "begotten, not made," and we find accordingly in the credo *genitum non factum*, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα.

⁸ Said by St. Thomas with reference to the artist's operation in the likeness of divine creation; the mental concept of the work to be done is literally the artist's child. A similar application occurs in the Indian texts, for example, ŚB iii.2.4.11, "Intellect prevents the Voice . . . were it not for the Intellect, the Voice would speak incoherently"; ŚB iv.6.7.10, "The Voice speaks not but what is contemplated by Intellect"; TS ii.5.11.5, "What he contemplates by Intellect (*yad dhi manasā dhyāyati*), that he utters by the Voice"; cf. RV i.20.2, where the Rbhus, the artists of the gods, "wrought by conjoining Intellect with Voice" (*vacoyujā tataḥsur manasā*, where *tahs* has the sense of working like a carpenter with an axe on wood, in this case that wood of which the world is made). The work of art is always the embodiment of a *conception*. See Coomaraswamy, "The Vedic Doctrine of 'Silence'" [in the present volume—ED.].

coessentiality of the Son with the Father, as in AB vii.13: "Becoming an embryo, he enters the wife, the mother, and being renewed, is born again (*punar . . . jāyate*)." There is a delegation and transmission of the universal Nature in the *genealogia regni Dei* just as there is of a particular human nature in a dynastic succession of functional types; it may be added that a "rebirth" in this sense—"the doer aright is ordinally born in his children," RV vi.70.3; "my children are my coming to be again," JUB iii.27.17; "that he has engendered is his going on again," CU iii.17.3—constitutes all that is, properly speaking, the Indian doctrine of the reincarnation of the individual, as distinguished from that of the transmigration of the Spiritual Person who, when the body dies, "hurries again to a womb," BU iv.3.36—reincarnation and transmigration coinciding only *in divinis*. The separated Voice now assumes a vehicular function, that of the liturgy in its verbal aspect, the Ṛc, elsewhere identified with this world and the Earth. The "Great" (*brhat*, implying an indefinite extension in time and space), at first contained as an embryo (*garbha*) within the Unity and now transferred by vital operation to the Mother, in whom it waxes, and of whom it is born, is primarily Agni, the visible and audible Prajāpati,⁹ considered here in a liturgical aspect: "He is born from the Titan's loins and shines in the Mother's lap" (RV iii.29.14), the altar-womb of Mother Earth.¹⁰ That the "Great" is said to have lain "great while within" (*iyog antar*) is a form of expression characteristic for Agni, as in RV x.124.1, "a great while hast Thou lain in the long darkness" (*iyog eva dīrgham tama āsayiṣṭāḥ*), and for his cognate Dīrghaśravas as in PB xv.3.25, where the "Far-cry" "was long in exile and in want of food" (*iyog aparuddho śanāyah* [not yet come "eating and drinking"]).

⁹ Agni (or Indra, Sūrya, or Soma) is as much the "Great Liturgy" (*brhad uktha*) as, literally, a Fire. Cf. RV v.87.1, where the hymns are described as "born of the Voice" (*vāci-niṣpannā*). We have discussed elsewhere the identity *in divinis* of sound and light. The Son is as much a resonance as luminous and calorific. The Son of God is an utterance; "In the beginning, this world was unuttered" (MU vi.6).

¹⁰ In Christian nativities of the Byzantine type, where there is a broken cave in place of the later and more familiar ruined stable (the significance of both is the same in the last analysis, as is also the case in the Vedic tradition, where the creative act involves the breaking open of a cave which is also a stable of cattle), it is made as clear as possible that the Theotokos is the Earth, Gaia. It is, moreover, with perfect accuracy that Wolfram von Eschenbach sings, "the Earth was Adam's mother . . . yet still was the Earth a maid. . . . Two Men have been born of maidens, and God hath the likeness ta'en of the son of the first Earth-maiden . . . since He willed to be Son of Adam" (*Parzival*, I, ix.549 ff.).

The worlds are ever impatient for the birth and coming forth by day: "When shall the Child be born?" RV x.95.12.

Another and very informative text is that of BU 1.4.1-4. Here the account of the creation begins with the Spirit (*ātman*) "alone in the aspect of Person (*puruṣa*)." This person in the beginning "was of such sort as are a man and a woman closely embraced (*etāvan āsa yathā stri-pumān-sau sampariṣvaktāu*). He desired a second. He caused that Spiritual-Self of his to fall atwain (*ātmanam dvedhāpātayat*).¹¹ Thence came into being 'husband and wife.' . . . He had intercourse with Her: thence were human beings engendered (*mānuṣyā ajāyanta*)." In the same way He and She assuming other than human forms begat their like in these animal types.¹²

Thus once more the One becomes Many by an act of generation. Again, the converse operation by which the conceptually separated self is reunited to the ever undivided Self or Spiritual Essence is a "deification" described as a marriage: "This is that form of his that is beyond the meters,¹³ that hath smitten away all evil, and that hath no fear. It is as when one is closely embraced (*sampariṣvaktāh*, corresponding to *sampariṣvaktāu*, above) by a darling bride and knows naught of a within or a without, even so that the (spiritual) Person (of a man) embraced by the prognostic Spirit (*prajñātmanā*)¹⁴ knows naught of a within nor a without. That is his true form, in which his desire is obtained, the Spirit is the whole of his desire, he has no unfulfilled desire, nor any grief" (BU IV.3.21).

¹¹ As in RV x.27.23, "In the dwelling of the gods had been the first; from their diremption sprang the latter."

¹² RV 1.179.2, *nu patnir vṛṣabhir jagamyuh*; x.5.2, *vṛṣano samjagmire . . . arvatibhīh*. "Our original nature was by no means the same as it is now. . . . For 'man-woman' (*āndropūyuvov*) was then a unity in form no less than name," *Symposium* 189E.

¹³ *Aticchandā*, usually rendered as "beyond desires," but we think it means, rather, "beyond the meters," which are the means by which he is approached.

¹⁴ *Prajñātman*, the fore-knowing and all-knowing Spirit, whose "true form," transcending all distinction of subject and object, is a "unitary condensation of prior gnosis" (*eḱībhūta prajñāna-ghana*, Muṇḍ. Up. v; *ḱṛtsna prajñāna-ghana*, BU IV.5.13), i.e., a single totality of knowledge not derived from any source external to itself—"the One Word of the Ineffable which is the Gnosis of the Whole" (*Pistis Sophia*, Codex Askew, ed. Petermann, p. 233). *Prajñā* is etymologically and semantically the equivalent of the Gnostic *prognosis* (*πρόγνωσις*), spoken of in the *Apocryphon of John* as belonging to the male-female Pentad of the Aeons of the Father, and as having been the first gift bestowed by the Invisible One upon the First Man, the Virginal Spirit, the Image of Himself (cited from Schmidt, in Charlotte A. Baynes, *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise*, Cambridge, 1933, pp. 8, 9).

It would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that the whole ontology of the Vedic tradition, alike in the Samhitās and in the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, is expressed rather typically than incidentally in terms of sexual symbolism. We have not by any means exhausted the material, some of which is far more outspoken than are the texts that have been discussed; but we think that enough has been said to demonstrate the perfect orthodoxy of the Tantras in these respects. It remains to consider the divine polarity and bisexuality in Christian scripture and exegesis.

The problem is directly suggested by the doctrine of the two-fold, temporal and eternal, birth of the Son of God. Let us remember that it is impossible to think of these as having been two different events in the divine life, which is intrinsically uneventful. Indeed, as St. Thomas says himself, "On the part of the child there is but one filiation in reality, although there be two in aspect" (*Sum. Theol.* III.35.5 ad 3). All this suggests that there must have been an eternal as well as a temporal Madonna.¹⁵ And that is clearly what is implied by Meister Eckhart: "His birth in Mary ghostly was to God better pleasing than his nativity of her in the flesh" (Evans ed., I, 418). If St. Thomas says that "eternal filiation does not depend on a temporal Mother" (*Sum. Theol.* III.35.5 ad 2), are we not entitled to add, "but on an eternal Mother"? Who then is Eckhart's "Mary ghostly" but "that divine Nature by which the Father begets" (*Sum. Theol.* I.45.5.6), *Natura naturans*, *Creatrix*?

In case it should seem that we are forcing the sense of St. Thomas, let us consider the Thomist doctrine of the divine procession. "The procession of the Word *in divinis* is called a generation."¹⁶ . . . Generation means the

¹⁵ [On the two Aphrodites, one *Oūpāvia*, the elder daughter of Heaven (*Oūpavós*), the other, the younger, daughter of Zeus and Dione, called *Πάνδημος* (= *Vaisvānara*), cf. *Symposium* 180D.]

¹⁶ It may be remarked that it is a cardinal doctrine of Christianity that there is no potentiality or passivity in God, who is all in act. On the other hand, while for St. Thomas "The power of generation belongs to God" (*Sum. Theol.* I.41.5, and as must also be assumed from the general use of *γίγνομαι* side by side with *ποιέω* in the Greek New Testament), he says also that "In every act of generation there is an active and a passive principle" (*Sum. Theol.* I.98.2c). A reconciliation can be effected if we consider that the conjoint principles *in divinis* are not two separate beings; just as in the case of the Three Persons, of whom there can be predicated characteristic functions without impugning their co-essentiality. There is no *unrealized* potentiality in God; at the same time His inexhaustible potentiality remains intact without diminution: as in BU v.1, "When plenum is taken from plenum, plenum remains." The conjoint principles *in divinis* are those of a static Essence (*bhūtātā*) and dynamic Power (*śakti*) [Eckhart, Evans ed., p. 276, "Es-

origin of any living thing from a living conjoint principle (*a principio vivente conjuncto*); and this is rightly called 'nativity.' . . . So, then, the procession of the Word *in divinis* is of the nature of a generation. For it proceeds in the manner of an intelligible act, which is a vital operation (*operatio vitae*). . . . Therefore is He rightly called begotten, and Son. Hence also that these things which belong to the generation of living things are used in Scripture to denote the procession of the divine Wisdom; that is to say, by way of conception and birth (*conceptione et partu*); for, as it has been said of the person of the Divine Wisdom, 'When there were no depths, I was brought forth (*concepta*). Before the hills was I brought forth (*parturiebar*)' (*Sum. Theol.* 1.27.2c and *ad 2*, citing Prov. 8:24, 25).

The whole of Proverbs 8 recalls RV x.125. Compare, for instance, "Unto you, O men, I call. . . . Hear; for I will speak of excellent things; and the opening of my lips shall be right things. . . . I am understanding; I have strength. By me kings reign. . . . I love them that love me. . . . The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. . . . When he prepared the heavens I was there. . . . I was by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him, rejoicing in the habitable parts of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men. . . . All they that hate me love death," with "I wend with the Rudras, Vasus, Ādityas, and several Angels; I am the support of Mitrāvaruṇau, Indrāgni, and the paired Aśvins. . . . I am the Queen, in whom all goods are garnered, most knowledgeable. . . . Through me all eat the bread of life, whoever sees, or breathes, or hears; though unawares, all these abide in me. Hear ye my faithful saying, I, none but I, utter what is most pleasant, both to

sence, so far as it is *active* in the Father, is Nature"; cf. Hermes, *Asclepius* III.21]; when these are actually divided, static and dynamic become active and passive, and this is one of those senses in which it can be said that "Nature recedes from likeness to God," inasmuch as She becomes the *recipient* of form; and then it can be said, with Dante, "cima nel mondo, in che puro atto fu prodotto. Pura potenza tenne la parte ima" (*Paradiso* xxix.32-34), "Summit of the world, where pure act came into being; pure potentiality was in the nether part." [On *Mathnawī* 1.2437, "She is a ray of God, she is not your darling: she is creative, you might say she is not created," Wali Muhammad in his *Sharh-i-Mathnawī* (Lucknow, 1894), p. 156, comments: "for the attributes, *agens* and *patiens*, belong to the essence of the Creator and both are manifested in woman." Note also RV III.31.2, *anyah kartā . . . anya rndhan.*]

men and angels: him whom I love I make an Awful-power, Brahman, or Prophet, or Comprehensor. . . . I that am the matrix in the Waters and the Sea, bring forth the Father, [i.e., as the Son] when I originate, being his head. . . . My breath it is, forsooth, that blows the Gale, whenas I take in hand the several worlds to fashion them: so far my sway, I do insist beyond these heaven and this wide earth." In the first of these citations it is Sophia, and in the second Vāc that speaks.¹⁷

It is sufficiently clear from the text of St. Thomas quoted above that his "conjoint principle" *in divinis* corresponds to the notions of Essence and Nature ("that Nature by which the Father begets," *Sum. Theol.* 1.41.5c); and that he identifies this Nature with the "Wisdom" of Proverbs, Dante's Sophia, whom he (Dante) calls "the bride of the Emperor of Heaven, and not bride alone, but sister and most beloved daughter," and of whom he says that "She exists in him in true and perfect fashion as if eternally wedded to him" (*Convito* III.12).¹⁸

A greater authority can be cited in Gen. 1:25, 26, "And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness. . . . So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."¹⁹ The likeness is exemplary. The created form of humanity is not that of this man as distinguished from that of this woman, but that of their common humanity: "He called *their* name Adam," Gen. 5:2. This Man (Adam) is, in fact, a syzygy, until the Deity brings forth the woman out of him, that he may not be alone.²⁰ "She

¹⁷ [Cf. CU VI.1.4, *vācā ārambhāṇa*, only cause of the variety of appearances; on Hokhmah (= Sophia) as God's "wife" or "daughter," cf. D. Nielsen, "Die alt-semite Mutttergötten," ZDMG, XCII (1938), 550.]

¹⁸ Whom also Dante addresses as "Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son" (*Paradiso* xxxiii.1). A similarly "incestuous" confusion of relationships is met with in the Indian, and even also the Islamic formulations (cf. Coomaraswamy, "The Darker Side of Dawn," 1935, p. 5, and *A New Approach to the Vedas*, 1933, p. 3 and nn. 9 and 10); in other words, the polarity of the conjoint principles is not merely analogous to that of male and female in one particular and marital relation, but in all possible reciprocal relations.

¹⁹ On this passage see the Commentary in the *Zohar* I, 90-92, "the Father said to the Mother by means of the Word" and "the Man of emanation was both male and female, from the side of both Father and Mother."

²⁰ Observe the parallel in BU 1.4, where Prajāpati divides himself, desiring a second, because "for one who is alone there is no delight." Another parallel that may be noted appears in connection with the Biblical description of Eve as having been made from Adam's rib (Gen. 2:21-22), just as in RV x.85.23 the daughter of Manu is called the "rib" (*parīu*), "through whom (under the name of Iḍā or Iḷā) he generated this race of men" (ŚB 1.8.1.10). This Iḷā is also a name of the mother of Agni (RV III.29).

shall be called Woman because she was taken out of Man," Gen. 2:23.²¹ "In this likeness," then, could never have been said had there not already been an archetype of this polarity in God—that is to say, of course, *in principle*, for we are not speaking of a composition *in divinis*.²² The Christian doctrine, moreover, like the Indian, envisages an ultimate reunion of the divided principles, there where "there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one [Skr. *ekī-bhūta*] in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28).²³ That is where it is no longer a question of this man or that woman, but only of that Universal Man of whom Boehme says that "this champion or lion is no man or woman, but he is both" (*Signatura Rerum* xl.43).

If it be objected, finally, that all this sexual phraseology is a sort of rhetoric and not to be taken literally, we say that while it is not a matter of rhetoric in any "literary" sense, it is a matter of analogy and symbolism: as is explicit in both passages from the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* cited above, it is not a question of a man and a woman in fact, nor of any existence, but of the form of being which is "as if it were (*yathā*) that of a man and woman closely embraced." Our whole intention has been to indicate that an adequate symbolism of this sort has been universally employed in the unanimous and orthodox tradition and, more specifically, within the limits of the present article, to show in what like manner it has been employed in the Hindu and Christian forms of the transmitted revelation.

²¹ "All living creatures, having been till then bisexual, were parted asunder, and man with the rest; and so there came to be males on the one part, and likewise females on the other part" (Hermes, *Lib.* l.18).

²² Cf. the *Apocalypse of John* (cited by Baynes, tr., *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise*, p. 14), "The Three, the Father, the Mother, and the Son, the perfect Power"; and SA vii.15, "All that is declared to be One. For the Mother and the Father and the Child are this all."

²³ [Gal. 3:28 is cited by St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.* 1.93.6 ad 2, in illustration of his own statement, "the image of God belongs to both sexes, since it is in the mind, wherein is no sexual distinction"; *Omne quod generatur, generatur ex contrario*, *Sum. Theol.* 1.46.1 ad 3.]



Two Passages in Dante's *Paradiso*

It has now for some time been fully recognized that Islamic analogies are of singular value for an understanding of Dante's *Divina Commedia*, not only in connection with the basic form of the narrative¹ but as regards the methods by which the theses are communicated.² And this would hold good, entirely apart from the consideration of any problems of "influence" that might be considered from the more restricted point of view of literary history. It has been justly remarked by H. A. Wolfson that the mediaeval Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin "philosophical literatures were in fact one philosophy expressed in different languages, translatable almost literally into one another."³ Again, if this is true, it is not merely a result of proximity and influence nor, on the other hand, of a parallel development, but because "Human culture is a unified whole, and in the various cultures one finds the dialects of one spiritual language,"⁴ because "a great universal line of metaphysics is evident among all peo-

[This essay was first published in *Speculum*, XI (1936).—ED.]

¹ See Miguel Asín y Palacios, *La Escatología musulmana en la Divina Comedia* (Madrid, 1919), and the abridged translation by H. Sunderland, *Islam and the Divine Comedy* (London, 1926).

² Luigi Valli, *Il Linguaggio segreto di Dante e dei "Fedeli d'Amore"* (Rome, 1928); René Guénon, *L'Ésotérisme de Dante* (Paris, 1925); *idem*, "Le Langage secret de Dante et des 'Fidèles d'Amour,'" and "'Fidèles d'Amour' et 'Cours d'Amour,'" *Le Voile d'Isis*, XXXVII (1932), and XXXVIII (1933). Indian and Zoroastrian comparisons have been made in Angelo de Gubernatis, "Dante e l'India," *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, III (1889), and "Le Type indien de Lucifer chez Dante," *Actes du X^e Congrès des Orientalistes*; and J. J. Modi, *Dante Papers: Viraj, Adamnan, and Dante, and Other Papers* (London, 1914). Many of the problems are bound up with those of the history of the Templars and Rosicrucians.

³ *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, Cambridge, Mass. (1934), I, 10.

⁴ Alfred Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur* (Berlin, 1929), p. x.