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SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY AND TEMPORAL POWER
IN THE
INDIAN THEORY OF GOVERNMENT

"Puru... agnim... dadidheam, RV. VI. 10.1.
Tasmāī visāḥ svayām ved namate, yāmin brahma rājani pārva eti,
RV. IV. 50.8.

Bhadreś abhi kṛṣṇah prāhi, bhāspātīḥ puratīte nastu, TS. III. 1.1.4.

"Brahma puratātin ma ugraṁ rāṣṭram svayām aṣṭaṁ, AB. VIII. 1.

"Predam brahma predam kṣatram... brahmakṣatrayōḥ samārīyati,
AB. III. 11.

"Rājan, satyam param brahma... satyam saṃgataṁ aṣṭaṁ āstī te, Mbh. I. 60.25 (Poona ed.)."

I.

IT MAY BE said that the whole of Indian political theory is implied and subsumed in the words of the marriage formula "I am that, thou art this, I am Sky, thou art Earth," etc. addressed by the Brāhma Priest, the Purohita, to the King in AB. VIII. 27. This being so, and as it has been pretended that these words were addressed by the King

"Make ye Agni your Fore-man" (Purohita); "To him in whose realm the High Priest goeth foremost, the people of themselves do homage"; "Go on thy way from good to better, Bhāspati be thy forerunner!"; "The Spiritual-authority foremost, be my dominion dread and unassailable!"; "Forward the Spiritual-authority, forward the Temporal-power! unto their union"; "Truth, O King, is the Supreme Brahma; be the Truth thy consort."

Abbreviations: RV., Rigveda Śaṁhitā; TS., Taittirīya Śaṁhitā; AV., Atharva Veda Śaṁhitā; VS., Vājasaneyi Śaṁhitā; AB., Atharva Brāhmaṇa; KB., Kaśyapaki Brāhmaṇa; TB., Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa; PB., Pañcarāna Brāhmaṇa; JB., Jaininīya Brāhmaṇa; JUB., Jaininīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa; SB., Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; GB., Gopātha Brāhmaṇa; AA., Atharva Āraṇyaka; BD., Byad Devata; BU., Byadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad; CU., Chāndogya Upaniṣad; KU., Kaṭha Upaniṣad; TU., Taittirīya Upaniṣad; MU., Maithri Upaniṣad; BG., Bhagavad Gītā; Manu, Mānavas Dharmāstrā; VP., Vigna Purāṇa; Mbh., Mahābhārata; A., Aṣṭutara Nikāya; D., Dīgha Nikāya; DA., Saṁyutta Nikāya; Dh., Dharmapada; DhA., Dharmapada Athakathā; Sn., Sutta Nipāta; J., Jātaka; Mhv., Mahāvamsa; Sum, Theol., Summae Theologica; SBE, Sacred Books of the East; HOS, Harvard Oriental Series; JAOS, Journal of the American Oriental Society; JISOA, Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art; HJAS, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies.
to the Priest, it becomes desirable, if the theory is to be understood, to establish once for all that, as is explicitly stated by Sāyana, it is the Purohitā that utters them. A comparative study of many other contexts will show, indeed, that it is inconceivable that they should have been spoken by the King, who is unquestionably the “feminine” party in the “marriage” of the Sacerdotium (brahma) and the Regnum (kṣatra).

We must premise that Mitrāvarunā, and likewise Indrágni or Indrā-ṛhaspati, are syzygies or progenitive pairs (mithunāni): Mitra, Agni and Brhaspati being on the one hand the divine archetypes of the Sacerdotium or Spiritual authority (brahma) and Varuna and Indra those of the Regnum (kṣatra). We shall, for the most part, make use of the Brahmāpas, but it must not be overlooked that the institutions therein more fully described and explained are often referred to in the

*Evola, J., *Rivolto contro il mondo moderno*, Milan, 1934, p. 105. Evola's thesis, in his discussion of the Regnum, forces him to misinterpret AB. VIII. 27. Had it not been for this, his admirable chapter "Uomo e Donna" (of which an English version was published in *Vārasbhurati*, Feb.-April 1940), applied to the true relationships of the Sacerdotium and the Regnum (approximately "Church and State"), would have acquired a greater significance. As it is, Evola's argument for the superiority of the Regnum, the active principle, to the Sacerdotium, the contemplative principle, is a concession to that very "mondo moderno" against which his polemic is directed.

His argument is as much a perversion of the Greek as it is of the Indian doctrine. In the Greek tradition the heroic kind or caste (γέως = jati), alike in the soul and the community,—"that part of our soul which is endowed with bravery (ἄρεια = Skr. vīrya) and courage (θυρέ, Skr. Vhā), and which is the lover of victory" (φιλεμακος = Skr. jīra) (Plato, Timaeus 70 Λ),—is the best part of the mortal or animal soul, superior to the appetitive and inferior to the spiritual and immortal part that lays down the law. As such its seat is in the heart, between the bowels and the head; it is the defender of the whole community; its function is to listen to the Voice (λόγος) from the Akropolis, to serve (εντοιχίσω) and cooperate in battle (κόμαχος είμαι) with the sacred principle against the mob of the appetites (within us) or of moneyed men (in the city). The three parts of the soul (or body politic) thus evidently correspond in hierarchy to the brahma, kṣatra, and víś, respectively the Sacerdotium, Regnum, and Commons of the Vedic tradition (in which the śāstra is represented by the Asuras); and there can be no possible doubt of the superiority of the sacred to the royal character.

That the Spiritual Authority, Plato's ἱππός, etc., is also the Ruler, Plato's ἄρχω, etc., just as the brahma is "both the brahma and the kṣatra," means indeed that the Supreme Power is a royal as well as a priestly power, but quite certainly does not mean that the kṣatra considered apart from the brahma is itself the supreme authority or anything more than its agent and servant.

A. M. Hocart, in *Les Castes*, Paris, 1938, p. 65, repeats Evola's error, saying "L'homme et son épouse sont le ciel et la terre, de même que le roi et le prêtre" where he should have said "de même que le prêtre et le roi."
Rgveda. Thus in RV. X. 52. 5 “Into thy hands, O Indra, I (Agni) commit the bolt,” cf. RV. II. 11. 4 “We have laid the bolt in thy hands”—corresponding to the Accipe sceptrum of Western rites—is the making of the King in divinis. The relation of authorizing Mind or Reason (kratu) to the efficient Power (dakṣa), that of the inner to the outer man, is explicit in RV. VIII. 13. 1, “Indra, at the Soma pressings, cleanses (punite, Śāyana  środayati = sōdape.iru, cf. MU. VI. 34. 5 f.) the enunciative Counsel (krátum ... ukth yum); the Mighty wins increase of Power (vidē vṛddhasya dākṣasah)”; cf. RV. X. 31. 2 and ŚB. IV. 4. 4. 1 discussed below. In RV. X. 124. 4 Agni, the Sacrificial Priest (agnir brahmā ... vṛdhartā, RV. VII. 7. 5), is described as “choosing” (vṛgāṇāḥ) Indra: it is interesting to observe that already the Commons play a part in this election (viśo nā rājānam vṛgāṇāḥ, ib. 8, cf. AV. III. 4. 2). The “marriage” of the Purohita (Saptagu, Brhaspati) to the King is referred to in RV. X. 47. 1 “We have taken thee by the right hand,” spoken reproachfully with reference to Indra’s arrogance and breach of the loyalty demanded by the marital relation of the Regnum to the Sacerdotium; as in BD. VII. 54 f. That the Purohita, as the designation itself implies, takes precedence of the King is explicit in RV. IV. 50. 7-9, “To him the people of themselves pay homage, in whose realm the Brahmā goeth first” (pār̥va eti), quoted in AB. VIII. 27.* The feudal relationship of the Regnum to the Sacerdotium is

*The Bolt (eajra) being the most essential symbol of the Kingship as a delegated power (RV. as cited, and TS. II. 1. 3. 4, ŚB. I. 2. 4. 1, V. 4. 4. 18, XIII. 4. 4. 1). If we also find the royal “virility” (=vīra) equated with the bow (ŚB. V. 3. 5. 30), no antimony is involved, the bow being clearly analogous to the eajra (both are held upright and grasped in the middle), and the arrows discharged from it corresponding to those which are actually the penetrating points of the eajra, from which they are derived in TS. VI. 1. 3 and ŚB. I. 2. 4. 1. The bow is as much as the eajra a solar weapon; the bolt is a “shaft” of light, the arrows that the Sun discharges are “shafts” of light.

*Brhaspati, whose identity with Agni, Priest and King, is unquestioned, is “seven-mouthed” and “seven-rayed” in verse 4 of the same hymn. He is regularly the Divine Sacerdotium (brahmé), and High Priest (brahmá) of the Gods, as Indra is the Regnum (kaatra). “Agni-Brhaspati” is the answer to the question asked in RV. VIII. 64. 7 brahmākastān (indrak) sāvaratī. The verses of our hymn are quoted in AB. VIII. 26, describing Brhaspati as the archetype of the human Purohita and Brahmá, who “takes after” him. The Brahmá is, of course, the infallible Brähman priest who does not take any active part in the Sacrifice, at which his presence is nevertheless indispensable. Himself remaining silent, his relation to the three other Brähman officiants whose operation is active and vocal is precisely that of Director to Executive; he is thus Brahmāsparati and Vācaspati (the brahmā, as rc, being precisely the vocalised brahmá). This is the explanation of “the very close connection of brahmá with vāc”
explicit in Agni's words addressed to Indra, "I in person go before thee . . . and if thou givest me my share (or due), then shalt thou through

(cf. AA. I. 1.1 and 1.3.8 with Keith's notes); as akṣara is Brahma, so akṣara (RV. VII. 15.9 and 36.7) is Vāc; this connection is nothing other than that of Maṇas = Prajāpati with Vāc, or that of Brahmā with Sarasvatī-Vāc in the "later mythology." It is not altogether easy to understand why Brahmā, the God, has been regarded as the creation of the "later mythology." (Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p. 118). It would rather appear that the Buddhists were essentially right in referring to Brahmā Sanākhumāra as the supreme deity of the Brāhmaṇas and to Indra Sujampati as his vassal. For Brhaspati, who is at once the brahmā and the brahmā of the Gods, is certainly himself a God, and why not, then, the God Brahmā, the person of Brahma? "Yonder Gods assuredly knew that Brahma of old." (AV. XIII. 2.13). The most that could be said is that brahmā in RV. is more a title than a name, and only later on becomes a name; but this changes nothing in the nature of the Person to whom the name applies.

It is only the actual iconography of Brahmā that is late, as is the Buddha's. In being "lotus-born" and therefore padmāśana, Brhaspati is still the Agni sprung from the "lotus" in RV. VI. 10.13, and "Vasiṣṭha the child of Mitrā-varunau, the Sacerdotium (brahmā) born of Maṇas and Urvaśī, whom the Viśve Devāḥ supported in the lotus," RV. VII. 35.11, where the equation of Mitra with Maṇas and Varuṇa with Urvaśī (l.) may be remarked. Vasiṣṭha, the Sacerdotium, is assuredly the Brhaspati who in RV. VIII. 90.13-15 "assumes a body in the womb of Anāṣumati" and enables Indra to overcome his godless foes "with Brhaspati as yoke-fellow" (bṛhaspatinā yudñ). We see now why Vasiṣṭha should be Indra's instructor (in the vīrañj, of which "he who gets the most becomes the chieftain," sṛṣṭhaḥ), and why formerly none but a Vasiṣṭha (descendant of Vasiṣṭha) becomes a brahmā, i.e. "a Brhaspati." (SB. XII. 6.1.38-4(l)) RV. VII. 33.14 yuddhāya addressed to Indra and his "Bull" (Maruta) corresponds to BG. II. 13 yuddhāya addressed to Arjuna. In RV. V. 48.5 Varuṇa "enduing the fair garment and operative with his tongue" (jīvāja . . . rājate ēhru caśaṇa), i.e. Varuṇa proceeding as Agni the Priest "with his purifying ladle" (pā concealā jyud, RV. XI. 2), is already, like the iconographic Brahmā, "four-faced." (citrumahā), Agni, the brahmā of RV. IV. 9.4 and VII. 7.5, himself explicitly "four-sighted" (citrumahā) in RV. I. 31.13, which is rightly understood by Śāṇaṇa to mean "facing towards the four directions."

Now bearing in mind that "Arjuna" is Indra (VS. X. 21, SB. II. 1.2, 12 and V. 4.3.7), or, what amounts to the same thing, Indra's son (Mbh.), that Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna, like Indrāgni (RV. VI. 50.5) and like Mātali (= Vaiṣṇu-Mātariśvan) and Indra (Mbh.), share a common cur and that "where these are, Kṛṣṇa the Lord of Yuga and Arjuna the Archer, there are fortune, victory, security of being and governmental-science" (ibid., BG. XVIII. 78) it is clear that Kṛṣṇa is the Sacerdotium (brahmā), as is Arjuna the Regnum (kṣatru), and Kṛṣṇa therefore to be equated with the Agni-Bṛhaspati-Vasiṣṭha, brahma etc. of RV. It is just because Arjuna is Indra—that Indra who is sanc-drā because he alone saw Brahma (AA. II. 4 = Ait. Up. 1.1, similarly JB. III. 203, cf. JUB. IV. 20-21 = Keśa Up. 14 l.) —that he alone is able to see Kṛṣṇa's "supreme form." (BG. XI. 47-48). BG. is an Arthaśāstra; its burden of the control of the senses and con-
me, O Indra, perform heroic deeds" (ayām ta emi tantrā purāstād ... yadd māhyam dīdhārā bhāgām indrah in māyā kruvave viryāni, RV. VIII. 100. 1). In RV. I. 18. 6 Sadassapti (who must be Agni, cf. RV. I. 21. 5

quest of self is identical with that which Kauṭilya describes as "the whole of this science" of government (see p. 88, infra).

Why then is Kṛṣṇa "black," as the name implies, or "blue-black," and Arjuna, as again the name implies, "white"? In the first place, the "Drop" that in RV. VIII. 96. 13-15 takes birth (avatiṣṭhāti), the regular expression used of the ātman when it mounts the body of the vehicle as Indra's fellow, and for which he has been longing, is "Black" (kṛṣṇa); according to Sāyaṇa, this "Kṛṣṇa" is the name of an Asura, presumably "Viśvarūpa, the son of Tvaṣṭr, a sister's son of the Asuras, who was the Purohit of the Gods" (TS. II. 5. 1. 1), i.e. Bhāsapti, āsūrya son of Tvaṣṭr, RV. II. 23. 2 and 17, and/or that "Uśanas Kāya of the Asuras" (TS. II. 5. 8. 5) with whom Kṛṣṇa identifies himself in BG. X. 37. Again because Agni and Indra are respectively the Golden Person in the Sun (Death in SB. X. 5. 2. 13) and the bright Sun itself (SB. X. 4. 1. 5), as in the eye, where the black (kṛṣṇa) represents Agni and the white (ūcāla) Indra (BU. II. 2. 2), "the blue, the deep black" (nīlam parāḥ kṛṣṇam), i.e. the pupil of the solar and the oeilcorneous eyes corresponding to the masculine, spiritual power (āmā, Agni, Vāyu, Āditya, ātman, ātman, etc.) and "the shining white" (ūcāla māsā) to the feminine, temporal Dominion (āṣā, Earth, Air, Sky, vision, ye, etc.), CU. I. 6 and 7. Cf. TS. III. 1. 1 where nīla is the proper color of the initiate, who by no means turn pale. It is clear that Kṛṣṇa's āsūrya vārga is that of the Divine Darkness, and does not imply a local origin from any swarthy aboriginal people, except in the ontological sense that the Asuras are "aborigines."

* The reference is to the performance of the Sacrifice, which is the primary "work" of the King above (Indra as Viśvākarma, RV. VIII. 98. 2) as it is of earthly Kings. Inasmuch as the King is the Executive (kārya), his is essentially the karmamārga, the "active life," as distinguished from the jñānamārga, the "contemplative life" of the Brāhmaṇa. Further, it will be seen that in giving Agni his "due" or "share" (bhāga) from Agni's point of view nasmayaṁ ca māṁ bhaṅgyā, as in BG. IX. 14—Indra becomes a bhaṅgṛty, just as in RV. X. 51. 8-9 where Agni demands his "share of the oblation" (hāvīga datta bhāgam), the Gods who grant it are bhaṅgṛtya. The like is implied for the human Sacrificer who gives his "portion" (bhāga) to Agni (RV. II. 10. 6) and "in appointing to each their share, endears the Gods" (pathā bhāgāṁ āśad decaṁ prāṣṭāti, AB. III. 4 and 38); cf. RV. IV. 2. 8-10, where the generous Sacrificer "in offering the oblation, endareth Thee" (priyam va te kṛṣṇe vaca hāvīgaṁ) and Ṣb. 14 where "dear to Thee be his invocation." So also in TS. V. 4. 5. 4 where Agni "endeared by the gift of his own portion (asena bhāgaḥbhāgaṁ pritiḥ), burns away the Sacrificer's evil" (pāparāṇam āpi jāhāti); cf. TS. II. 1. 4. 6 where Indra approaches Agni "with his own share" and Agni then burns away the sixteen coils of Vṛtra in which Indra is wrapped, and in like manner in the case of "whoever approaches him with his own share (asena bhāgaḥbhāgaṁ pritiḥ), Agni burns up his evil," and "approaches" might have been rendered by "takes refuge with"; the preceding texts from TS. are echoed in BU. VI. 3. 1 bhāga- dhyāyam juhmā, etc., and the Gods having been thus "delighted" (itrīdā), "may they delight me" (mad ... torpayaṁ), and a reciprocity is implied as much
sadaspiti indragni) is called "Indra's dear and lovable friend" (priyam indrasya kamynam); in RV. I. 80. 1 it is the Brahma that "prospers" him (brahmah ca kriya varahanam).

Our starting point will be SB. IV. 1. 4, where the Mixta Person of Mitravarnan is the "Counsel and the Power" (krutadaksau) and "these are his" two (selves), (asyatitv utmanah). . . . Mitra is the

as it is in the older bhakti texts; it is never for nothing that a man devotes himself. The "sacrificial offering" (pañjaiyam bhagyam) to which Agni moves in RV. X. 124. 3, in the same way implies a bhakti, here again doubtless Indra. That "Thou art ours and we are thine" (RV. VIII. 92. 32) implies no less a mutual loyalty, like that of thane and earl or wife and husband (cf. the oaths in AB. VIII. 15), that belongs to the very essence of "Bhakti."

The bhakti "tone" of RV. V. 46. 1 (hoyo na vaidasa anyi savayam . . . na . . . vanani, etc., corresponding to I. 190. 4 dyu na yasamad yaksahmad eocastah) and that of VII. 80. 7 (dras daso na milhitse kavaye oham) is unmistakable. The Sacrificer is identified with the oblation (havir vai diksatah, TS. VI. 1. 4. 5); it is himself that he devotes (AB. passim); the Sacrifice is a symbolic suicide (utmanam abhavate, AB. II. 3; cf. Eggeling's note on SB. I. 2. 3. 5, and the designation of the Sacrificer as atmayati in Maithri Up. VI. 10). AB. III. 8 combines the notions of the contemplation (dyana) of a deity, the offering of an oblation and that of sacrifice with an "endearment" (yastry devatayayi havir gyhitam ayasi tani dyayat . . . sakhad eva tath devatam prindati, pratyakshad devatam yajati). There is no real difference between the implications of these Vedic and Brahmana texts and that of, for example, BG. XII. 19 "He that hath 'devotion is dear to me' (bhaktimam me priyo nara). It would be naïve to maintain that the Vedic Sacrificer, who certainly performed "devotions" was not also "devoted," or that he never loved the "Friend" (Mitra).

Note the singular. The Mixta Person of Mitravarnan, Supreme Identity of Conjoint Principles, is the same as that of the "One Aksha that is both Agni the Sacerdotum and Indra the Regnum" (SB. X. 4. 1. 9); cf. RV. I. 108. 7 "Whether ye, Indragni, take your pleasure at home (sev durase, i.e. ghyam, ab intrin) or in the Sacerdotum and the Regnum "brahmados rajani ev, i.e. pradur, ab extra, in active administration). With sev durase here cf. JB. I. 146 yathagraham . . . yathajhitav ca, and Ku. II. 25. The Vedic "dual" divinities imply, for the most part at least, a binity (asygyy) of conjoint principles, active and passive in mutual relationship or both active in relation to things externally administered. The names of such dual divinities cannot always be adequately rendered by the simple use of an adjective particle. The resources of language and iconography are inadequate to the representation of an identity of contraries, such as dayita-tapau or yin and yang: we cannot think of contraries as coincident, but only as associated, and it may be, reconciled; in other words, the truth of this truth (asatyasa satyas) is paradoxical, asytasya channam. Thus Mitravarnan is not an aggregate or mere composition of an essence and a nature, but the one Mixta Person of both: while at the same time they are Mitr and Varuna, and whatever is born of such a pair proceeds ex principio conjunctivo. The differentiation of MU. VII. 11 is by no means a contradiction of advaita, for just as in Christian doctrine, essence and nature, being and existence, mercy and majesty are one in
Counsel and Varuna the Power, Mitra the Sacrodotium (brahma) and Varuna the Regnum (ksatra), Mitra the Knower (abhiguntra) and God. Monophysitism would have been as much a heresy from the Indian as from the Christian point of view.

The priority of the Counsel (ksatra) to the Power (daksa), i.e. of the contemplative to the active life, is already explicit in RV.VIII.13.1 where Indra purifies the former and so gains the latter.

It should be here noted that the order in which the component parts of a dual appear is purely grammatical (cf. Caland on PR.VII.7): the form Indragnut, for example, if taken literally to be "Indra and Agni" would be ineffective, it is "Agni and Indra" (RV.III.25.4) that is to be understood, for as AB.II.37 remarks, "These two as Indragnut were not victorious, but as Agnendra they won."

"Regarded as paramount Lord, Agni is Indra" (indraka paramasitvayug 'gnih. Sayaṇa on RV.V.2.3); "Agni is Indra to the mortal worshipper" (RV.V.3.1).

"Literally, "these two are of himself," i.e. "these are his two natures."

"For we must distinguish two things, the will and the power." (St. Augustine, De spir. et lit., 55). "Two powers are first distinguished (sukītavāra) from the Logos, a poetic (= kṣetra), according to which the artist ordains all things and which is called God (= brahma); and the royal power (= kṣatra) of him called the Lord (= isvara) by which he controls all things." (Philo as cited by Brehier, Les idées... de Philon d'Alexandrie, 1925, pp. 113-114). "God was not Lord until he had a creature subject to himself." (St. Thomas Aquinas, Sum. Theol., I.13.7, ad 6).

The "two selves" are the "two forms" of Brahma (BU.II.3, etc.), the "two natures" (desīthāvaca) of the "Great Self" (mahātman) in accordance with which he participates in both the "true" and the "false" (satyāntopahogārthah, MU.VII.11.8), or, as this might have been otherwise expressed, in virtue of which he is the common source of Devas and Asuras, that is, participates both in divine and human experience, the Gods being the Truth and men Untruth (68.III.9.4.1). The trace of the divine imminence appears in the two selves of the man who is devatman (JII.I.17, etc., see note 64).

Thus the Purohita is "the half of the self of the Kṣatriya." (śadāthma ha va eṣa kṣatrigaya, AB.VII.26), as are Sky and Earth (AA.III.1.2) and as is the man of the woman (68.X.5.2.8, BU.I.4.4), and neither is complete without the other (68.VIII.6.1.12, cf. also V.2.1.10), as also holds for Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna (Mbh.II.20.3 and 14). Hence the use of sārāham, literally "plus a half," in connection with any complementary union, as in JUB.I.48.7 where Prajñāpati sārdhavi saṃsait, i.e. "coupled with" Vāc. It is thus literally true that "the Purohita was in religion and civil affairs the alter ego of the king." (Keith, Rel. and Phil. of the Vedas, p. 292), or as we should rather say, the king the alter ego of the Purohita. For this does not mean that the two "halves" are reciprocally equal; on the contrary, the relation of one to the other is that of part to whole. The "only Vrātya" (Brahma, brahma) is the source of the brahma and the kṣatra (AV.XV.10.3 as rightly understood by Anfrrecht, pace Whitney), the brahma (Brahma) is both the brahma and the kṣatra (68.X.4.1.9), Agni is both (68.VI.6.3.5. IX.4.1.16). Mitra and Varuna (RV.VII.12.3).

In the case of Manas and Vāc, Vāc is the lesser, "for Mamas is by far the
Varuna the Executive (kārtrā). Now at the beginning these two were distinct (āgre nānā),* the Sacerdotium and the Regnum: then Mitra the Sacerdotium could subsist apart from Varuna the Regnum, but Varuna the Regnum could not subsist apart from Mitra the Sacerdotium.19 Whatever deed (kārma) Varuna did that was not quickened (āparsutām) by Mitra the Sacerdotium, was unsuccessful (nā ... sāmanāryāhe). So Varuna the Regnum called upon Mitra the Sacerdotium, saying: 'Turn thou unto me (āpa māvarṣa) that we may unite (sāmarjāvahai); I assign to you the precedence (pūras tvā karava); quickened by thee (tvat prasūtāh) I shall do deeds.' That is, therefore, the origin of the Purohita's office .... Whatever deed, quickened by Mitra the Sacerdotium, Varuna did thenceforth, succeeded (sām ... ānyāhe). The choice is mutual; if either the Purohita or the King be ill-chosen by the other it is called a commingling of right and wrong (sūkritām ca duṣkritām ca).

The expressions pūras tvā karava and tvat prasūtāh imply the technical terms Purohita, Purodhārī, Rājasū and Rājasūya. The Purohita,

more unlimited (āparsimitataram) and Vāc by far the more limited” (parsimitataram, 8B.I.4.4.7, cf. I.4.5.11), and these are the two aspects of Prajāpati, who is “both the limited and the unlimited” (parsimitaparsimita, 8B.VII.2.2.14, etc.). The Infinite, in other words, always includes the Finite as “its own,” of which it cannot be deprived, whether logically or really (cf. AV.X.8.29 and BU.V.1): it is the Finite nature that can be logically, if not really, isolated from the Infinite, and therefore stands in need of a “completion.” Cf. RV.III.31.2 where, of Agni’s parents, “one unpowers (ṛddha), the other is the agent” (kārta).

*The relation, in other words, is that of patron to artist, or in the artist that of art to operation, actus primus to actus secundus. And just as the King is only legitimately such to the extent that he does the will of a higher power—"Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven"—so the artifex as an efficient cause is only free to the extent that he agrees with the patron and is governed by his art, or, if not, is merely a “worker,” a “hand,” compelled by economic pressure or driven by his own sweet will or fancy.

*Agre: not ante principium (where there is only the Supreme Identity, tād ākara, yathā strīpūrṇānaṃ sampāriṣvavakta, BU.I.4.3), but with reference to the separation of the male and female principles, Sky and Earth, etc., in principio, because of which they are alien to one another until reunited by marriage: āgre here and sṛṣṭau in 8B.X.4.1.5 imply “before the reign begins” or “at the beginning of the reign” (pūrvakāle yasya rāṣṭraasya, Śayaṇa on 8B.VIII.1 and as in PB.VII.6.10); sṛṣṭau sudān in 8B.X.4.1.5 corresponding to “twofold in the beginning” (dvaśayam ... āgre).

Agre corresponds to in principio (Gen.I.1), now rendered “in the beginning,” but which almost all mediæval commentators, from St. Augustine (Conf.XII.20, 27, 29) onwards, have understood to mean “in the first principle,” in verbo, in suppletion, etc., without reference to time.

12Rāte implies not only a spatial separation, but an opposition.
literally "one put in front," "one who takes precedence," like Agni or Brhaspati in divinis, is the King's Brahmān adviser and minister. The Purodhātr is the King himself, who appoints the Purohita or, more literally, "puts him in front." The Devasvah are the deities—Savitṛ, Agni, Soma, Brhaspati, Indra, Rudra, Mitra and Varuṇa—by whom the King is "quickened" through the Priest who invokes them as "King-quickeners" (rājasvaḥ), so that "It is these Gods that now quicken (saṃvate) him, and having been quickened (sātah) by them, he is henceforth quickened" (śūkḥ sāyate, ŚB. V. 3. 3. 11, 13). He rules, then by "Divine Right." The Rājasūyā, or alternatively Varuṇasava is, then, the sacrificial and initiatory ritual of the "King's Quickening"; the most essential part of this rite is an "aspiration" (abhiṣeka, abhiṣecanīya),

The root in sāya, saṃva, sāt, etc., is sā. Many scholars distinguish two roots sā, (1) to "impel," or "instigate" and (2) to "quicken," or "generate." The latter meaning is obvious in RV. VII. 101. 3 where sāte (begets) is opposed to starīth (sterile), in I. 146. 5 where Agni, the "Sun of Men" is sāḥ, i.e. pravasāt, apādāyitī (Śaṇapāṇa) in relation to all things, in RV. I. 113, where savātah saṃvāya is "for the birth of Savitṛ," himself, and in BU. VI. 4. 19 where Savitṛ, "He of true quickening" (saṃvāt pravasāva), is invoked in the marriage rite, certainly as progenitive deity, Gandharva and Divine Eros. In our contexts it is this Savitṛ that is the primary instigator or quickener (MU. VI. 7 savanāt saṃvāt). If in some contexts sā is to have a "quicken" or "instigate" than to "quicken." (cf. sāyate = anūṣṭayate, AV. IV. 8. 1. Comm.), and may be replaced by forms of ī or causative forms of r (as in AB. II. 5), this is because it is only when Manas and Vāc are "personified" (as is usual in our texts, Manas being identified with Prajāpati, and Vāc as his daughter) that we realise that the consequence of an "instigation" of Vāc by Manas (or the Brahmā) is an embodiment of what has been "conceived" and is a "concept" (BU. II. 2. 3): the intellectual principle animating the mother of which it is to be born, just as in any other aspect of a logos doctrine. To "instigate" or "set in motion" or "move" is thus only a weaker value of "quicken"; the Purohita is really "fathering" his "Counsel" on the King who as the kṣatra is to give it effect by means of his sat. And this is only an extension of the acts of aspersion, etc., by which the King has already been "begotten" (sātah) and "brought to birth" (prasātah)—for this distinction cf. KB. V. 3 prajā ... ṣraṣṭā aprasātah = Ayavakta Up. VI. 1 prajāḥ apraṣṭaḥ sa jāyante, and BU. I. 4. 11 where the kṣatra is apraṣṭa, but evidently apraṣṭehem until the Rāja-

Eggeling discusses his translation of sā in SBE. XXII, p. 2, note 1. We adopt his usual rendering, "quicken." His occasional use of "spiriter," although true to the essential values, since here as in John VI. 03 spiritus est qui vivificat, is too awkward to be adopted. We have no doubt that the "two" roots sā are, or were originally, one.

The octad of King-making deities (Savitṛ, Agni, Soma, Brhaspati, Indra, Rudra, Mitra and Varuṇa) who endow the King with a variety of powers or virtues correspond to the "good fairies" of folklore who bring their gifts to the newly born solar hero.
cf. AV.IV.8.1, and this corresponds to what would now be called a "Coronation." The "Quicken ing" refers to the fact that the rite is both initiatory and sacrificial; the King is brought forth, new-born from the initiatory death, by the officiating Priests who are, in this respect, his "fathers." 13

13 The word abhisheka is too often, and especially by translators from the Pali, rendered by "Coronation." It is true that Indra wears a crown and is kirtita accordingly, that Rudra is turbaned (upasasin) and that the Mahapurasas is upaksara-sraddha, but the putting on of crown or turban plays no important part in the early Indian rites, where it is an "Aspersion" rather than a "Coronation" that makes the King.

Not all the water in the rough rude sea
Can wash the balm from an anointed King.

12 For the Priest as the Sacrifice's "father in God" see JAOS 60, 1940, pp. 50-51. It must be understood that the Rajasuya is "a congruous rite" (tad yodma kriyate, SB. V. 3. 26), so that all that is said elsewhere of the ritual death and rebirth of the Sacrifice can be applied to the King, a fortiori. Accordingly, "He who performs the Rajasuya becomes the "Child of the Waters." He (the Priest) brings him to birth" (janayati, "delivers," in the medical sense and analogically), SB. V. 3. 19-24—a generation that corresponds to that of Indra as King in RV. VIII. 97. 10 tataksur indram jajanu en rajas, comparable to X. 61. 7 ajanman brahma cerd vedapadita svatopadum sir atakshan. And this is why the Rajasuya is also the Varunasava, for the ritual employs the text of VS. X. 7 where Varuṇa, enthroned in the dwellings of men, is called the "Child of the Waters." If this is more often an epithet of Agni, it is in place here because the nascent Agni "is Varuṇa" and "becomes Mitra" only when "kindled" (KV. V. 3.1), and the Sacrifice's regeneration is likewise a "kindling" (SB. IV. 4. 5. 23). The intention is to enthrone as King, not a "Varuṇa," but a "Mitra."

As Hocart has remarked with respect to rites of royal installation, "The theory is that the King (1) dies, (2) is reborn, (3) as a god." (Kingship, 1927, p. 70). In this sequence, however, he was unable to recognize the "death" in the Indian sources, chiefly SB., although he recognized that all regeneration necessarily implies an antecedent death. As to this, it must be remembered that any initiatory rebirth, or indeed a birth of any kind, implies a previous death; for initiatory death may be cited JUB. III. 3. 4 evam etad dikṣayanti ... yatnasya vrāvyasa tadd rūpam bhavati. Any Sacrifice is a symbolic suicide; it is himself that the Sacrifice sacrifices to the Gods, to Agni (SB. II. 3 atmaṇam śakāhate; and SB. passim); cf. my "Ātmayajña" in HJAS. VI. 358-398, 1942. Moreover, the installation of a King parallels not only that of Varuṇa, but that of King Soma, and although it is for a "supreme sovereignty" and "not for slaying thes" that Soma is bought, nevertheless "when they press him they slay him" (SB. III. 3. 2. 8), saying: "Fear not . . . it is the evil that is slain, not Soma." and "Thereby he slays all his evil" (sārccast pāpam āhati, VS. VI. 35 and SB. III. 9. 4. 17-18). The beating of the King which puts him above the law, so that he can do no wrong (SB. V. 4. 4. 7) is analogous to the pressing of Soma by which "his evil" is removed. In the same way the expiatory bath with which a Sacrifice concludes, taken not in flowing ("living") but in Varuṇa (stagnant) waters, is a kind of death (cf. CU. III. 17. 5 maruṇam evābhṛtya), and com-
"The Counsel and the Power" are the equivalents of Plato's essentials of good government, *philosophia* and *dynamis,* of the Islamic "Mercy and Majesty" (*jālāl* and *ḥādāl*), in Christian theology of the spirit that giveth life and the letter that killeth (II Cor. III. 6), and of our "Right and Might." "Counsel" (*krauta*, *spāra*) might have been rendered as "Will," in accordance with the definition in our text, ŚB. IV. 1. 4. 1, "Whenever with one's mind (mānasā) one wills (kāmāyata) anything, such as 'This I want' or 'This I would do,' that is the 'Counsel,'" cf. RV. X. 129. 4 kāmas... mānasā rētaḥ prathamām, AV. XIX. 52, AA. I. 3. 2 manasā hi sarvān kāmān dhyāyati... rācā hi sarvān kāmān vudati, and JB. I. 68 mano ha vai praṇāpitar devātā, so kāmāyata; or by "Authority," what we have a mind to do being the authority for what we actually do. The act expresses what was willed. This being so, we see that "the Counsel and the Power" correspond to Philo's poetic and ordaining "God" and controlling "Lord" (see note 7), or in other words to "his will" and "him" in Eph. I. 11 "the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his will." In TS. V. 2. 3. 5 where the "Counsel" is "the beginning of the Sacrifice" (*yaṇā-mukham*)

parable in this respect to a baptism; the immersion is for the sake of a liberation from all that pertains to Varuṇa, i.e. from evil, and by it "just as a serpent casts its skin, so is the Sacrifice freed from all evil (sūrvasmat pāpmaṇo sūrvam-cayate), there does not remain in him even so much sin (śanā) as there is in a child" (*yācār kumārē, ŚB. IV. 4. 5. 23*), words which, applied to a king, would mean "even so much evil as there was in him when a prince." Thus in various ways the King "dies" and is reborn; the old, Varuṇya, man is put off, and the new, Maitreya, man put on, a change that is reflected in the investiture with new garments which follows the immersion, cf. AV. XIV. 2. 44 "Clothing myself anew... as a bird from an egg, I am freed from all sin."

Such an absolution is essential. The King is, indeed, "another man" in the sense of I Sam. X. 6. Hocart cites the fourteenth century Jean Golein who held "that the king is as much cleansed of his sins" as one who takes orders (Kingship, p. 93). Charles I wore white robes at his Coronation "to declare that Virgin purity with which he came to be espoused unto his Kingdom" (Heylin, *Cypricius Anglicus*, 1662, p. 145). "Espoused to his Kingdom," i.e. as ṣhāpati, "Husband of the Earth"; for just as the King is the "wife" of the Priest, so is the Earth in turn his "wife": just as Soma is united to "these quarters of space as his bride (āabhir digbhir mitāsvaṇa), with his dear domain" (priyga ḍāmāṇa, ŚB. III. 9. 4. 20), so is the human king to his own land (deśa), the shooting of arrows to the four quarters in the ḍigviṣya rite being evidently a symbolic demonstration of this relationship. The quarters are, of course, always feminine in relation to their centre and meeting point; e.g. RV. IX. 113. 2 where Soma is ḍaśāṇa pati, cf. AV. II. 10. 4, AA. II. 2. 3, ŚB. III. 9. 4. 21.

134 "Apart from a coincidence of these two, political power and philosophy, there can be no cessation of evils, whether for the state or for the individual" (Republic 473 D).
and is deposited in the East (the place of origin of the brahma), Keith renders kṛatu by "inspiration," which is certainly a legitimate value when the application is to the individual realm, as in RV. X. 31. 2 utā svēna kṛitunā nām vadeta, kṛatu here representing the Synteresis. It is preeminently Sāvitrī, Brhaspati, the brahma or Brahma (TS. V. 3. 4. 4) that "inspires" our contemplations (dhiyā go naḥ pracoḍāyat, RV. III. 62. 10, the Gāyatri or Sāvitrī); the Priest at once inspires and inspires the King. When the Sacerdotium and the Regnum act together, then both possess the counseling power; in RV. I. 93. 5, for example, Agni and Soma are "of joint counsel" (sākṛatā), as must also be understood in the many contexts in which the Regnum (Varuṇa or Indra) are possessed of "counsel" or "counsels" = powers.

Thus Manas, "Mind," or rather "Intellec{{ 14 }}t"—regularly equated with Prajāpati (TS. and SB. passim), and often with the Breath—corresponds to kṛatu, the "Counsel" and to abhiṣaṅtr, the "Knower"; and Vāc, the "Voice"—the daughter, messenger, only property and bride of Manas-Prajāpati (SB. VIII. 1. 2. 8, TS. II. 5. 11. 5, PB. XX. 14. 2, AB. V. 23, etc.)—corresponds to daksā, the "Power" and kartri, the "Executive" or "Agent,"—"Brhaspati is the Spiritual power, Vāc the Royal" (brahma vai brhaspatir . . . vāg vai rāṣṭri, AB. I. 19, cf. Vāc as rāṣṭri in RV. VIII. 100. 10 and X. 125. 3). The Sacerdotium as Director corresponds to the aśābda Brahma, and the Regnum as Factor to the śabda Brahma. It is with reference to the śabda Brahma (the "spoken Word") that it is said in JUB. II. 9. 6 that "Vāc is the brahma (mantra), and that this air" (i.e. a vibration), and with reference to the aśābda Brahma that it is said in JUB. I. 43. 3 that "Vāc is whatever is on this side of Brahma (i.e. 'under the Sun'), and it is taught that what is otherwhere is Brahma." Brhaspati, Brahmanaspati, the silent Brahma, is to Vāc as is the silent to the audible Brahma. She exists in him more eminently (silence is golden, speech is silver); but without her "support" no enunciation of his Will is possible.

14 Manas in all our texts and as identified with Prajāpati, passim, is the Scholastic intellectus vel spiritus, the divine mind and will, and it is only later that manas in the sense of external mind or reason and modern "intellect" is subordinated to buddhi as "pure intellect"; our manas in other words is sev, as in Hermes I. 6. 11b where "The Father is sev, the Mother φώτος, ἀδήσε τον Son." Manas, for SB. X. 5. 3. 1, is that Supreme Identity (tād ekāh), that was in the beginning when "this" universe neither was nor was not (RV. X. 129. 1-2). As remarked by Keith, mana in the narrower sense of mental "organ" appears first in Kaś. U. III (AA., p. 46); this lower and merely rational "mind" is the seat of "opinion" rather than of knowledge (MU. VI. 30). The "two minds," pure and impure, are distinguished in MU. VI. 34. 6 and elsewhere, as in Plato and Plotinus. The word āravat, to change one's mind" implies the replacement of the impure by the pure sev.
In a traditional society, whatever is said by whoever “has the say-so” is “no sooner said than done.” It is not with his hands but by his flat or edicts that a King “works.” He is the “Voice” that gives effect to the purposes of the Spiritual authority, and thus does the will of God on earth." When what is done vocally is done indeed” (vācā kṛtaṁ karma kṛtaṁ, Mahānārayana U. IV. 7). Just as in dinwadi “Indra, the Regnum, is the Voice” and it is by this voice that Agni performs the Sacrifice (karoty eva vācā ... gamayati manasā, JUB. I. 33. 4), so it is at the Royal Sacrificer’s word of command that the “work” (karma, the sacrificial work essential to the welfare of the kingdom) is done (SB. I. 9.1. 8), “it is with the Voice that he says ‘Do this,’ and there with the altar is built” (SB. X. 5. 1. 1). The dual government “knows all purposes intellectually (manasā hi sarvān kāmān āhyātā) and announces them verbally” (vācā hi survān kāmān vādāti, AA. I. 3. 2). Just as the Purohita is “preferred,” so “Intellect takes precedence of Voice (purāśatā vācā ... carati ... and were it not for Intellect, the Voice would only bābbāla” (SB. III. 2. 4. 11, where for manas and vāc could be substituted brahma and kṣatra; cf. I. 4. 5. 11): even in the ritual, whatever is uttered by a Hotri that has not been prompted by the Maitrāvarūṇa (Brahmā) is asurya (AB. II. 5). We have seen that what the Purohita “knows” (abhigatṛṣ) the King performs (kartri); in other words “the Voice speaks not but what is ‘known’ (abhigatam) by Intellect” (SB. IV. 6. 7. 10), and of this filial and wisely obedience we can say truly that “the discipline of Logos, caught up with the vision of Mythos, is a royal marriage” (L. F. Kinney, in Journal of Philosophy, XXXIV, 1937, p. 358).

When the royal “Voice” is thus informed, “what is done vocally is done indeed” (yad vācā vācā karoti tad etad evaśya kṛtam bhavati, JUB. II. 2. 8): Priest and King speak “with one voice,” and just as it is only when instigated (prāśatāḥ) by the Sacerdotium that the King is effective (SB. IV. 1. 4. 5), so in the same way “whatever the subject does un stimulated (apurāśatāḥ) by these two, the Sacerdotium and the Regnum, is

**44** That it is the King’s function by his flat to give expression to the spiritual Counsel, implies the traditional doctrine that human law echoes or reflects Divine Law. Thus, for example, the King, “who was to be a ‘divine man’ and so link the people with the spiritual order,” is regarded as “the incarnate representation of supreme and universal Law. In him that Law, itself unformulated, could become vocal (loγικός); that is, the ideal man had the power of taking a Law which was spirit and divine purpose, and of applying it to human problems. Through him the Law, or nature of God, could become statutory laws, and true laws for society could never, it was universally believed, be had in any other way” (Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, 1940, pp. 38-39).
misdone (akrtam) and men belittle it, saying: "Even what he does is un-done" (akrtam)" (AB.II.38). It follows from the foregoing that

Just as in SB.IV.1.4.3 "whatever the Regnum does (yad dha kim ca . . . karma ca kare) unquenched (dpusta) by the Sacerdotium, therein it fails" (na . . . samardha) or conversely "succeeds" (daydha). We see from this collation that krt and asyrdha, akrt and aasyardha are equivalents: that what is "misdone" is really "not done" at all. Thus the privative a in akrt does not deny an event, but asserts that the "event" was not an act but a failure to "act." The verb "to act" has strictly speaking only a good and positive sense, as when we speak of God as "all in act"; a sin is not an "act" but an "omission." St. Thomas Aquinas in the same way speaks of the sinner as "non-existent" (Sum. Theol., I.29.2 ad 4), not meaning to say that no one sins. In the same way, too, stot, literally "not being," is also in many contexts "naughty," i.e. evil; not a mere nothingness, but a mere potentiality. All these propositions depend on the principle ens et bonumconverterunt, common to all traditional metaphysics. In BG.XVII.27-28 sar and asat are in all cases categories of what the Nominalist would call "real" things. In JUB.I.53.1 the two worlds—Sky and Earth, with all their equivalents, m. and f.—are respectively sat and asat.

The question is of importance in connection with the so-called Vedantic doctrine of "illusion." It is evident that whatever is an "appearance" (rupa) must be an appearance of something and that whatever "significance" (asamsa) is attached to this appearance must involve a correct or an incorrect interpretation of its basis. It is by means of the intelligible and the sensible, "name and appearance" (namasrupa), that which is referred to by Vais and recognized by Manas, that Brahma, Deus abacositus (brahmavods parardham aparicchat), "returned" (pratyacchati, "came down again," i.e. descended as avatara) to these worlds which are coextensive with what can be sensed and named." (SB.XI.2.3.3-6, cf. BU.I.4.7, S.II.101, D.II.63, 64), becoming thus, and thus enjoying, both what is "real" (asya) and what is "false" (asya, TU.II.6, cf. MU.VII.26.8); it is, indeed, by a marriage of these two, satya and asya, affirmation (as) and negation (as), that man is propagated and multiplied (taye sarvasya prajapti bhagam bhasyati, AA.II.3.6). Our functional existence, unlike our being, is logical and analytical, determined equally by what we are and what we are; we distinguish subject from object and content from form.

There are, of course, "true" and "false" names of things; the former correspond to their essences or formative ideas and the latter to our own thinking. SB.XI.3.2.5, having in mind the latter and conventional nomenclature, remarks that of these two, "name and appearance," the latter is the "greater." From this point of view it is the appearance that is "real" and the name that is "false"; it is not our senses but our interpretations that are at fault; we do see the glitter (cf. BU.V.14.4), but are wrong in assuming that all that glitters is gold. An ascription of "unreality" to temporalia does not mean that appearances do not appear, but that we are mistaken in describing them as "things" and not simply as appearances, and misguided in trying to find out what they are instead of asking "of what?" are they the appearances (cf. S.A.V.8 = Kaun. U.III.8) mistaken in assuming that these are the appearances of any thing, rather than of a protean no-thing "veiled in all things" (BU.II.5.18). It is
it is not for the King to say (command) or do anything or everything he likes, but only what is “ordered to the end” and thus “correct” (sādhā, SB. V. 4. 4. 5). The King, in other words, is a sādhaka, whose “art” is the science of government, the “King’s leading” or “policy” (rājānti, nitiśāstra), in which the Purohita has been his Master: for “science” (vidyā, i.e. truth as distinguished from opinion) is a combination, or ensemble (sānhita = sāndhi), or in other words the child, of Intellect and Voice, both of which are essential to an enunciation of truth, and just as in the case of the macrocosmic and microcosmic harps, of which the concert (sānkhīḍa) of the player with the instrument is the force (trīṣṭ), so it is only the skilled speaker that “perfection of the value of the Voice” (kṛṣṇam vāgartham sāndhayati), and it is especially pertinent that it is said of him who understands this doctrine of the wedding of sound and meaning that “His renown fills the earth, men hearken to him when he speaks in the assemblies, saying: ‘Let this be done which he desires’” (ŚA. VII. 7, VIII. 9, 10, XIV). The essentially vocal character of government is well brought out in PB. XII. 10. 4, 5 where, when in the Rājasāya (quoting the text of RV. VIII. 70. 1, 2, “He who is the King of men, etc.”) it is said: “At that very point they reach the reign of the Voice (rājyam . . . vācaḥ), and thereby they betake the royal Sacrificer to his reign” (rājyam evaitāya yajñam gamayanti).

remarkable that in discussing this very question of the reality of the world Sextus Empiricus makes use of the familiar Indian parable of the snake and the rope, saying that the Sceptics by no means “abolish phenomena” but only “question whether the underlying object is such as it appears . . . our doubt does not concern the appearance itself but the account given of the appearance” (Pyrrhonism, I.227-228). So also Heraclitus (Apócrifos IV and XIII taken together). This is precisely the Vedantic position: the rope is not a snake, nor even “really” a rope, but “really” a manifestation of Brahma, “the Real who becomes whatever there is here” (TU. II. 6). In the same way, as we have repeatedly pointed out, māyā does not mean an “illusion” as distinct from a real phenomenon, but rather the means of creating any appearance whatever: that these worlds are māyāmaya does not mean that they do not “exist,” but that they are quantitative, or “material” in the sense of the etymologically equivalent mātrā, “measure,” to be understood in the sense of Heraclitus XX, “ever-living Fire, in measures (mēra) being kindled and in measures going out” (ἀναφερέσθαι = νεμώθα, as applicable to fire, wind and passion); to these “measures” of Heraclitus (cf. Plato, Timaeus 45B, C, where vision is a part of the internal fire) correspond the tajomātrāḥ of BU. IV. 4. 1 = prāṇānavāy of Praśna U. IV. 3, i.e. the human elements or “powers of the soul.”

For māyā, from vma and as denoting the principle of measurement and thus the means of creation see “Nirmānakāya” in JRAI 1938, pp. 81-84, and AV. XIII. 2. 3 and 5, nāṭāra ṣaṅkī kṛṣṇa māyāḥ . . . dīcna ca sūrya prthiścina ca decim ahorātā viniśācena yad āpi.
This is why the King cannot be allowed to talk at random, to say what he likes, but only to speak wisely; this is why the Kṣatriya, who is so much like a woman in other respects, is said to love wisdom (paññā = prajñā), where she loves ornaments (alamkāra, A. III. 363). For the King is only a true King in so far as he is in possession of his royal art or science, in so far as he does not fail of the end (na khyate arhati), and does not miss the mark (sādhu bhavati, tapi karādhati); he is only a “right” (sādhu) ruler in so far as he is governed by his art, but “crooked” (vyāna) if he is guided not by the truth but by his own inclinations; that verum scientia nihil is as true of the art of government as of any other.

If the Oriental and traditional Monarch is not a “constitutional ruler” whose actions merely reflect the wishes of a majority of his subjects or those of a secular minister, nor King by virtue of any “social” contract, but a ruler by Divine Right, this does not imply that he is an “absolute” ruler, but on the contrary that he is himself the subject of another King, as is explicit in A. I. 109, an echo of BU. I. 4. 14 where it is affirmed that the Law (dharma), than which there is nothing higher, is the very principle of royalty. We see, accordingly, what ultimate value attaches to the expression “King of Kings” (adhirāja rājām), and that while the “constitutional monarch” may be controlled by his equals, or even his inferiors, the ruler by Divine Right is controlled by a Superior.

Let us consider the marriage of Indrāgni in SB. X. 4. 1. 5, where Agni is expressly the Sacerdotium (brahma) and Indra the Regnum (kṣatra). They say to one another: “So long as we are thus, apart, we shall be unable to bring forth offspring; let us twain become a single form” (ekam rupam ubhār avam = sambhavavahai as in JUR. I. 54. 6 = saka nāv avam in PR. VII. 10. 1), i.e. as we should say “become one flesh.” Accordingly, “They twain became one form” 11 (ekam rupam ubhār

11 “Became of one form” suggests the important problem, to what extent the Rājasaṅya endows the King with a priestly character, as in the Roman Imperial Rite in which the Emperor kneels before the Pope, who facit esse clericus and mitres as well as crowns him (Woolley, R. M., Coronation Rites, 1915, p. 50). The problem is not an easy one; but certainly the statement by Keith that “the connection of royalty with priestly rank, if it had ever been a motif of the growth of the kingship (in India), had long disappeared before the time of the Saññhītes” (Veda of the Black Yajus School, exii-exiii), is far too sweeping.

It must be borne in mind, again, that the Rājasaṅya is an “analogous” rite, and that every Sacrifice, being born of the Sacrifice, the Spiritual power (brahma), is born a Brāhman (brahma, patronymic from brahmā, and the Initiate (dikṣita) is for this reason to be addressed as a Brāhman, whatever his caste may have been (SR. III. 2. 1. 40): “the Sacrifice is the Sacerdotium (brahma), the Initiate is born again of the Sacrifice: he attains to Priesthood” (brahmaṇātāman upaśīti, AB. VII. 22-23).
abhavaśām), that of the Fire itself, and thereby brought forth offspring. The verses following (5-8) explain that in the concrete symbolism of the

It is certain that Indra, the archetypal King, functions also as Priest (brahma, RV.VIII.16.7, SB.IV.6.6.5) and as Cantor (udgāty, JUB.I.22.2), that he is a Prophet (ṛṣi, RV.VIII.6.41) and that he is constantly identified with the Sun. King Keśi (the Keśi Dārhiya of JB.II.63,54, JUB.III.29, and KB.VII.4; cf. RV.X.136) functions as the Grhapatī of a sottra (SB.XI.8.4.1); Weber thought this a survival from a former age (Indische Studien, X.25,94), but this is not acceptable, since whereas formerly only Vasiñṭhasa could function as the brahma (TS.III.5.2.1, SB.IV.6.6.5), now anyone having the requisite knowledge can be a Brāhmaṇa, and may be addressed as Brahmā (SB.IV.6.6.5, XII.6.1.10), the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣāda thus anticipating the supposedly Buddhist distinction of the “Brāhmaṇa by birth” (brahmāsṛṣṭha, DU.VI.1.1) from the Brāhmaṇa by knowledge, Brāhmaṇa as brahmaśīt. We learn, too, that “formerly, an inveterated king aspersed his own son” (Comm. on SB.XIII.8.2.19 where “the kṣatriya asperses the kṣatriya,” cf. MBH.I.69.44, Poona ed., where Duṣṣanta bhratūm ... yauvaratye bhṛyogopaṭaḥ, a practice that seems to have survived in Siam in connection with the very important rite of the Tounse of the Heir-apparent in which the King, impersonating Śiva, “poured the contents of the great chank shell upon the head of the prince” (H. G. Quaritch Wales, Siamese State Ceremonies, 1931, p. 130). In the Mahā-Gocinda-Sūtra the King himself asperses the Purohita (D.II.232); and it was probably by an aspersion that the King exercised his own powers of “quickenings” (naṣaḥ), when he bestowed accession honours on the eleven members of his court (scacā, purohita, mukṣī, etc.) who are called the “Recipients of Decorations” (vatiśaḥ, SB.V.3.1.12,—not to be confused with the “Seven Jewels,” saptis raśaḥ, of a Cakravartin, RV.I.5, VI.74.1, BD.V.123, although the categories partly coincide). Hocart points out that the “quickenings” of the Ratnīs is a ritual delineation: it will be observed that excepting the Queen there are ten male Ratnīs, and these with the King himself are presumably the “eleven Gods on earth” of RV.I.139.11. etc.

Furthermore, in the Act of Homage, the King is addressed as Brahmā and identified with Savitri, Indra, Mitra and Varuṇa, i.e. priestly as well as royal deities, the Brāhmaṇa taking a seat below him (TS.III.5.2.1, SB.IV.6.6.5, BU.I.4.11) while according to Manu (VII.2.1) a Kṣatriya who has duly received the “sacerdotal sacrament” (brahmaṇa saṃskāraḥ), i.e. has been initiated and aspersed, is a substance compounded in some measure of Indra, Anīla (Vāyu), Yama, Arka (Sun), Agni, Varuṇa, Candra (Moon), and Vīteśa (Kubera), and is like the burning Sun, so that “no one on earth can look at him who is a great God in human form” (nabakārt devātā ... navaśceṣa). On the other hand PB.XVIII.19.8 expressly reserves the Sacerdotalism from the Regnum, and innumerable texts sharply distinguish the Sacerdotal from the Royal functions; it is much rather the Sacerdotalism that exercises both (Brahmātī as fighting-priest, RV. pāśu), than the Regnum. It is evident that the installation of a King does not dispense with his or the kingdom’s need of a priesthood. That the King is the Sacrificer (rājasāṃs) and Lord of the Sacrifice (yajñaprīti) does not mean that he normally performs or conducts the rites, but that he is the patron who institutes, pays for and defends the Sacrifice on behalf of his people. He is “the Supporter of Rites” (dhyatvratā), and as such he may not say or
Fire-Altar, Agni is represented by the Golden Person (purusa) and Indra by the gold plate (rakma) that were deposited, and which represent the
do anything or everything, but only what is correct (sabha); he and the skriyana (indoctrinated Brahman) are the two "Supporters of the Rite" (skrityavatam, SB.V.4.4.5). Indra is typically vrutapad, "Fidei Defensor"; cf. RV.X.61.7 where "the effective god produced the Sacerdotium (bhrams), and made the Land's Lord (vastospatim), the Guardian of the Rite (vrutapad)."
The difficulties are best resolved by recalling that the Priesthood and the Kingship correspond to Sky and Earth, who were originally One, but departed from one another as soon as their unity had been consummated (RV.pasim, TS.V.1.5.2, V.2.4.1, BU.III.8.9, etc.). In the same way the King is assimilated to and identified with the Priest (as Arjuna is sometimes identified with Krsna in Mbh.) for the duration of the nuptial Sacrifice, but, just as in any other Sacrifice, "becomes again what he really is" when the rite is relinquished, thus returning from divinity to humanity, satya to sanya (VS.I.5 and II.28, SB.I.1.1.4-6, I.9.2.23, III.6.3.21, III.9.4.1, IX.5.1.12). It is, in fact, explicit, that having put off his Royalty and become a Brahman, the King in turn abandons this Priestly character: "when he concludes, he assumes his Ksatriya character, calling to witness Agni, Vayu, and Aditya (the cosmic Purohitas) that 'Now I am he who I am'" (AB.VII.22): it is then "not actually and evident," (na pratyaksam) but only symbolically and in an occult manner (paroksha) that "the Ksatriya assumes the form of the Sacerdotium" (brahmaṃ vрпam upasangachati) and therefore only transubstantially that he can partake of Soma (AB.VII.31); cf. JUB.I.40.3 where, notwithstanding that the Voice (vca) is the indispensable support of the Soma, "It is by no means by the Voice that the priestly office is performed, but in an occult way" (paroksha), i.e. mentally, in accordance with the injunction yajdvava... manas, RV.VIII.2.37, cf. TS.VI.1.4.5, KB.VII.4. In any case, that the King does assume the Sacerdotal character, however temporarily and in whatever manner, makes it impossible to say that "the connection of royalty with priestly rank had long disappeared." All we can say is that hardly any trace of any actual exercise of Brahmanical functions survives in the Brahmaṇas.

Just as the King assumes a Priestly character which he again relinquishes, so "in that he is aspersion (abhiseko) in the Rajasya, he ascends to the world of heaven, (but) if he did not descend again he would either depart thither beyond human beings (i.e. he would die) or would go mad" (PB.XVIII.10.10), a condition of equal application to any other Sacrificer (TS.VII.3.10, VII.4.4.2, AB.IV.21, etc.) ; the ritual delineation which prefigures an effective delineation post mortem—cf. Harṣocarita 215, devābhayaṃ gate narenre, "Now that the King has assumed his Godhead," i.e. has died, and the representation of Kings as deities in funerary chapels—would be presently fatal, as is indeed implied by the rule: "No one becomes immortal in the flesh" (SB.X.4.3.9). The royal Sacrificer's Himmelfahrt is nevertheless of profound significance: for the descent, a sort of avatarasya comparable to the Buddha's at Saikisa, and to Plato's return of the Philosopher to the Cave, is "by that stairway which, save to reascend, no one descendeth" (Dante, Parietis, X.86-87). It cannot be wondered at that in D.II.227, where Brahman Sanakhumara ("The Eternal Youth," i.e. Agni-Bhraspati, devānaṃ brahmā, cf. AV.X.8.44 utmānam... ajiraḥ
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Person in the Sun, and the Solar Disk itself, respectively (cf. BU. II. 2. 2. for an analogous distinction in terms of the "pupil" and the "white"
yavāṇām) appears in the Tavatimsa heaven amongst the Thirty-three Devas beside whom he takes his seat (and with whom he thus "consorts"), each of them experiences a beatitude which is compared to that of a Kṣatriya King whose head has been aspersed (muddhāvasisita, — aspersion beginning from the head, ŚB. IX. 4. 1. 15, etc.) and who as soon as he has been aspersed (udvinnabhīsita, − a sublime enthusiasm and sublime contentment"; for the King’s relation to his human brahmā is precisely that of the several Devas to their common Brahmā, cf. note 4. That the Regnum is only temporarily set above the Sacerdotium in the Act of Homage (TS. I. 6. 16 and ŚB. V. 4. 4. 9-13) is also apparent from BU. I. 4. 11, where we are told that the Sacerdotium was one simply in the beginning, and as such did not manifest omnipotence (ad ... vijātvavat, with implication of vihāra in the sense of "dominion," cf. note 28 and vihārą in BG. X. 40). That (One) manifested a more resplendent form (ārjya rāpum, cf. RV. X. 31. 2 ārjyānasā dākapum, "power and glory"), that of the Regnum, even the Devas who are Dominions (kṣatrāda, cf. TS. II. 3. 1. 4 cdvupāna vasi rāṣṭrāna), viz. Indra, Varuṇa, Soma, Rudra, Parjanya, Yama, Mrtyu, Iśāna.* There is, accordingly, nothing above the Regnum (kṣatrādvdvā rāṣṭrā naśati) in the Rājasūya the Brahmā pays homage to the Kṣatriya from a lower position; he expressly glorifies the Regnum (kṣatrā ravā dāvo dādāhāti). But "the Sacerdotium is the source of the Regnum, so that even though a ruling King attains supremacy (paramādām, like Varuṇa’s in ŚB. V. 3. 3. 9), he finally (astata, i.e. when the Rājasūya is ended) leans upon (upāśrayati) the Sacerdotium as his source, and if he (the King) injures him (the Brahmā), he is striking at his own source, and he becomes the worse (pāpiyān bharati), having injured his superior" (ārjyāνām). Saṅkarā is clearly right in saying that the "glory" and "supremacy" are references to the Act of Homage at the enthronement, but that when the rite is relinquished it is the King who "gives precedence" to the Purohita, whose designation itself purports "Praepositus."

Texts, of course, abound, in which the relative inferiority of the King to the Priest is affirmed. The Brahmans are not his subjects, "their King is Soma" (TS. I. 8. 10d, ŚB. V. 4. 2. 3); everything here is "food" for the King, but he himself is "food" for the Brāhmans (ŚB. V. 4. 2. 3, Sn. 610; Kauś. Up. II. 9); Soma’s throne is borne by four men, but the human King’s only by two, since Soma rules absolutely all (asva sakft śrivasyaśe) but not so the other (ŚB. III. 4. 26); the Brāhmans are not committed to the Kṣatra, whose "rod" (danda) is not for them, while they on the other hand have a "counter-rod" (pratidanda) that can be used against him or any of his subjects (PB. XVIII. 10. 8), i.e. the power of the curse or excommunication, the case of Nahūṣa, who was for a time the King of the Gods, providing an example (Hopkins, Epic Mythology, p. 130). That the King is inferior in hierarchy to the Priest is emphasized by Oldenberg (Die Religion des Veda, 1894, pp. 375, 376) and by Weber (Indische Studien, X. 160 and "Über den Rājasūya," K. Akad. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1893, p. 118). Oldenberg (p. 376) speaks of the "priestliche Prestige, welches schwach ent-

* With some changes of name, this octad is doubtless to be identified with the octad of king-making deities mentioned in note 11.
of the solar and microcosmic eyes); that Agni is represented by the "baked" (i.e. mature) material of the Altur and Indra by the "unbaked" ("half-baked," immature) material, whereas when the Fire is blazing this distinction disappears, the whole is "fired" and fiery (cf. "It is this Agni that he thus kindles by these two, the brahma and the kṣatra," SB. VI. 6. 3. 15). Thus Indra becomes of one progenitive form with Agni, the form of the Sacrifice itself, from which the Sacrificer is to be reborn, the Fire being a womb (agnir vai devayonih, AB. II. 14) into which the Sacrificer inseminates himself (JB. I. 17, etc.) and from which the Priest brings him to birth (yajñād devayonyai prajanayati, AB. III. 19).

wickelte königliche Individualitäten hoch überragte," while Weber ("Rūjasāya,"
p. 118) remarks that "Das scharfe Drängen auf die Unterwürfigkeit des Königs, welche die Darstellung des Alt. Br. durchzieht, fehlt in Epos" and refers to the "unbedingte Nothwendigkeit, das ein König einen Purohita (Hauspriester) habe (die Götter essen sonst sein Opfer nicht) und denselben unterthänig und gehor- sam set." Weber's "fehlt in Epos" reminds us that the Temporal Power in India, as in Europe, gradually freed itself from its originally legitimate status of agent (kāry) of the Spiritual Authority, and that as remarked by Rhys Davids in Dialogue 2.287, note 1, with reference to the position of the King as described in the Mahā-Govinda-Sutta, "a king was of lower rank than now." This last is the same as it would be to say that Satan was of lower rank before his fall than after the assertion of his independence. How different from our own are the traditional values of feudalism may be seen in the fact that the slave was once regarded as the superior of the hired man: a colleague of mine, while living in Persia remarked to a messenger, "I suppose you are the Sheikh's servant," and received the proud answer, "No sir, I am his slave." We have learnt to confuse servility with loyalty and rebellion with freedom. In fact, "Le service héréditaire (serfdom) est tout à fait incompatible avec l'industrialisme actuel et c'est pourquoi il est peint sous des couleurs aussi sombre" (Hocart, Les Castes, 1938, p. 238, italics mine).

77 Vrata is "operation" (vratam iti karma nāma, Sāyaṇa on RV. X. 57. 6) and like karma with primary reference to sacrificial operation (cf. Lat. operari = scire facere): as is explicit in SB. I. 1. 1.1 and I. 9. 3. 22 where vrata = yajña. Operation is twofold, "interior" (yajña) and "exterior" (ṣṭapit). These two "operations" are essentially those of the Sacerdotium and the Régnum in divinis. As that one the deity is "idle" (avrata, cf. nā yajñāne in BU. I. 4. 11, and apravastatt in CU. III. 12. 9 and Kaup. I. IV. 8), or, as this is expressed in TS. I. 6. 9. 5, "The operations are mingled at night, the better and the worse lie down together." (saṁ hi nāktaṁ vratāṁ sṛjānte, caṅkā śṛgāṇā ca pāpyāṇā cīśatā): but when "proceeding to the sacrificial part" (yajñāmas dhāgām eva, RV. X. 124. 3), "supremely operative" (vratānāma, RV. VIII. 44. 21).

Vrātya implies the potentiality of operation. Brahma, the brahma, is then the "One and only Vrātya," the source of the brahma and kṣatra proper to Bhṛṣpati and Indra, who becomes the Loci (āśvā) on whom all beings attend, and arming himself with Indra's bow "covers up the hostile brotherhood" (ūprijayam bhṛatr-
The āpōs γάμος is effected again in TS.V.3.4 where there is union (sāmiti, samawapana) of the two Āgni, viz. "Agni that was before and

vyana) and "pierces him who hates" (dṛṣṭaṃ), AV.XV.1.6-6, XV.3.10, XV.10.3-6, cf. IV.1.3. Otherwise stated, the "only Vṛātya is Vāyu," is the Gale of the Spirit that blows from the four quarters as the Kings Indra, Iśāna, Varuṇa and Soma and from above as Prajāpati (JUB.III.21.3) or Praśa-Prajāpati, the Breath (Praśāna U., II.7). Thus the unmanifested Brahma enters into the worlds as Priest and King, as Āgni-Bhraspati and Indra; he is the archetypal "Guest" and King whom his satellites welcome with the cry "Here comes Brahma!" (BU.IV.4.37). His welcome is a kind of Rājasūya. It is natural, then, that the throne (āśanti) prepared for the Vṛātya in AV.XV.3 should resemble Brahma’s in Kauś. U. I.5 and Indra’s in AB.VIII.12, and likewise the Buddha’s throne in the early iconography, for all these are "Guests" to be welcomed as Kings.

Vṛātya in the plural is, then, by analogy an epithet that can be applied to any Brāhmaṇa considered as a manifestation of Brahma, or equally to any alien guest who is qualified by nature to be received into the Aryan fold and inducted into the Aryan operations (dvāra evaḥ, RV.X.65.11): we see that for the Aryan householder or King to address the stranger as a "Vṛātya" (AV.XV.10.1-2, 11.1-2, 12.1-2) is to pay him the highest honour and to say in effect: "We are altogether your servants." Thus the tradition of hospitality is based on metaphysical principles, hospitality is a rite, the guest is a living symbol of the deity. It becomes understandable, also, why it is that a guest may be feared as well as honored: it is an enemy that comes to be received as a friend, a Varuṇa whom one receives as a Mitra; the "welcome" is in any case a "pacification" (āśanti, from āsam) and is a "quieting" analogous to that of the āśanti who gives the quietus to the sacrificial victim,—it should not be overlooked that the proceeding deity is, in fact, himself the Sacrifice (RV.X.13.4, X.81.5, ŚB.435, etc.). This is especially clear in KU.I.7 where the Brāhmaṇa guest is called a "Fire" and tāṣaṇa...āśanti refers at the same time to the extinction of the "Fire" and the pacification of the "Guest," as in TS.V.1.6.1 where "the waters are pacifications, and with these pacifications he quiets Agni’s burning-anguish" (āpo evaḥ āśantiḥ, āśantiḥ cesāṇa śaceva śaceva śamapati, śaceva corresponding to the "sharpness of the fire-flash" contrasted with the "meekness and light" in Bohmen, Three Principles, XIV.69-77); cf. the extinction or pacification (āśanti) of the Fire in PB.VIII.7.8, and the value of āśanti in Pali Buddhism where the extinction or pacification of the fire of life is the same as Nibbāna. Sāmāna in MBH. is both to "kill" and to "make peace with," since in "making peace," we put an end to the enemy and generate a friend; it is logically impossible to make "peace with an enemy," whom like Varuṇa we can only approach when we have "made him a friend" (mitrakṛtya), and this passage from enmity to friendship (cf. the double entendre of hostis), like all other transitions, is the death of what was and a birth of what is. In BG.VI.7 where the empirical self has been "overcome and pacified" (jīva prāśantaḥ, prāśanta has all the values of "sacrificed," "made sacred," "made holy," as in the ritual Sacrifice itself, where the Sacrificer is identified with the victim and called a "self-sacrificer" (āśayati, ŚB.XI.2.8.13, cf. I.8.3.18, etc., and Manus, XII.91).

This digression has been necessary to an understanding of dvāra, a word that
the one (now kindled) in the Fire-pan, who hate one another” (vi... 

drisāte), incidentally a very significant statement of the natural opposition

of the Conjoint Principles. Their union is effected with the marital formula of TS. IV. 2. 5. 1 “Be ye united, of one intention, loving one
another (sāmitam sāmkalpethām sāmpriyau)... I have conformed

your minds, operations and wills (sām vām mānāh sām vratā sām u 
cittānya d'karaṇa)... Be ye unanimous, sharing one home, for our 
sake” (bhārataṁ naḥ sāmanasau sāmokasaau), cf. RV. V. 3. 28, X. 65. 8, 
X. 191, and AV. III. 8. 5. The last words “Be ye unanimous, etc.”

occur also in TS. I. 3. 7 where they are used for the union of the Fire-
sticks, equated with Purūravas and Urvāśi as parents of Agni-Āyuś.

With this marriage of those “who hate one another,” cf. RV. X. 191, 

and AV. III. 30 “Let not brother hate brother (nā bhrātā bhrātarūm 
dvīsat)... an incantation (brahma) in virtue of which the Gods are

neither sundered from nor hate one another” (na vyānte nā ca vidvīsate 
mthāḥ), of which the application is also to “husband and wife” (pati, 
jam), i.e. Sky and Earth, the Father who separates from his Daughter 
(RV. X. 61. 6 vyāntaḥ), these “Two worlds” that go apart from one 

another (AV. III. 31. 4 vimē dvāprthiviḥ itāḥ; TS. V. I. 5. 8 imaū lokau 
vā itām, V. 2. 3. 3, dvāprthivī... vyātī; AB. IV. 27 tuu vyāsatām; 

PB. VII. 10. 1 tāu vyāntau, etc.).

This union of mutually antagonistic principles, the “former” and the 

“latter,” i.e. elder and younger, is essentially that of Varuṇa with Mitra, 

for “Thou, Agni, art born as Varuṇa, and it is as Mitra that thou art 

can only be rendered correctly by “operation,” and equated with kārma; it should 

be added that all occupations are traditionally sacrifici al rites, cf. RV. IX. 112. 
1-2. where the vocations of the priest, the carpenter, doctor, and fletcher are all 

equally vratāh. We can now understand the full meaning of saṃvartā which is 

quite literally that of “cooperative,” and that of pativrata, a “devoted wife”; 
to use a later word, the “wife,” the “royal” partner, is to act as sahadarmiṣṭa, 
a partner in the fulfilment of the Eternal Law, which as sahadharma becomes the 
Law of his own Vocation; the analogous saṃvartā in AV. XIV. 1. 42, TS. I. 1. 10, 

and JU. I. 54. 6, and implied in the Arthasāstra I, adh. 9, “The King should 

obey (maṃvarta, i.e. should be saṃvartā with respect to) the Purohitā, as is 
a pupil to his master, a son to a father, or a serf to his feudal lord” (saṃśātri), 
and as might have been added, as is a wife to a husband whom she should “love, 
honor, and obey.” Contrasted with these cooperations, the alternative of other 

and independent operation (anvuvarta) would be satanic (RV. X. 22. 8, VS. 
XXXVIII. 20), cf. AB. II. 5: where “instigated by the Mind the Voice speaks 
(manuśv uti itātē vāg rudaṭā), but what she uttereth absent-mindedly is of the 

Asuras and not acceptable to the Gods” (yaḥ hy anvuvrata vācām vāgādi anvuvrata 
eśa uta vāg adevauṣṭā; the “Mind” here being the sacrificial Maitrāvaruṇa, i.e. 
the brahma, and the “Voice” the hōṛ, functionally feminine).
kindled” (RV. 3.1). It is the former, chthonic (purṣya = bhūkṛṇa)\(^{18}\) Agni that is Varuṇa, and “not Mitra,” which is as much as to say amitra,

\(^{18}\) That the marriage of the two Agnis, kṣatra and brahma, in TS. V. 2. 4 is a union of mutually antagonistic principles, reflects the natural opposition of Sacerdotium and Regnum and natural antagonism of the sexes. “What pertains to Mitra does not pertain to Varuṇa” (Śb.III. 2. 4. 18): “The kṣatra takes no delight in the brahma, nor does the brahma take delight in the kṣatra” (Śb. XIII. 1. 5. 2. 3); amoris sine dictioone radix et causa est similitudo (Ecclesiast. XIII. 10), and as Eckhart adds, E converso vero dissimilitudo est causa odio. The natures and functions of the Sacerdotium and the Regnum, like those of man and woman, are distinct: the marriage is a reconciliation that reflects their transcendental unity (“Agni is both Mitra and Varuṇa,” RV. VII. 24. 3; “Brahma both kṣatra and kṣatra,” RB. X. 4. 1. 9; Christ “both King and Priest,” St. Thomas Aquinas, Sum. Theol. III. 31. 2 ad 2). Weber was thus essentially correct in speaking of the marriage formula with which the King and the Priest are united in AB.VIII. 27 as “eine alte, solenne Formel, welche die innige Zusammengehörigkeit der contrairenden Theile zu maskiren bestimmt ist” (Indische Studien, V. 160; italics mine). The very word mitkramam implies a “clash” of contraries, and mitikha is “false” as being “contrary” (to the truth).

For the marriage of mutually antagonistic principles cf. AV. III. 8. 5 “I bend together your minds, operations and intentions, ye who are of contrasted operation, those of yours I bend together” (saim yo māñādā sām eva tathā sām ākkāte namānāmi, omi yā vairātā sthānam, tām eva sām namānām). This is primarily, no doubt, addressed to Sky and Earth; in a hymn “for supremacy” (āruśṭya) it would be applicable to the analogous brahma and kṣatra. The wording is closely related also to that of TS. IV. 2. 5. 1 and RV. X. 65. 8 and X. 101.

At the same time the kindling of Agni is the quickening and resurrection of Varuṇa. Agni becomes “his father’s augmenter” (veddhanam pitāḥ, RV. I. 140. 3 and thus his “father’s father,” pitās pitā, RV. VI. 16. 35), the Son reproducing the Father whom he displaces. The two Agnis of our texts are the one that “falls” (dies) with Soma and Varuṇa (= Cyavāna) in RV. X. 124 (agniḥ soma śa varuṇaḥ te cyavante) and the one proceeding as God (devaḥ) from the Non-god (śeṣaḥ, i.e. from the asura pitā, now Deus absconditus, mūra deva, like Praja-pati, jīva mūraḥ in PB. XXVII. 17. 3) from the non-sacrificial to the sacrificial part (asyātiyād paśaṅgam bhagam āmi) and who with a view to immortality (prapāyaśaṣyaṁ amsattacena) abandons (ākṛmanti) the Titan Father, choosing (caṇḍavaḥ) Indra; cf. RV. IV. 26. 7 where Indra abandons (ajahāt) the seven deities (śaṭdā, ac. deśāḥ), VI. 47. 17 where Indra rejects his former friends, who do not follow him, and seeks others, VI. 69. 1. “Your parents, foes of the Gods, Indrāgni, are smitten down, and ye survive,” and X. 69. 10 where Agni, the Youngest, vanquishes the Ancients, though they were friendly. The abandonment of the Father by Indrāgni corresponds to that of Cyavāna in JB. III. 77. The reversal of the kingdom (parydeard rāstraṁ) in RV. X. 124 is reflected in TS. VI. 6. 5 where Varuṇa is the type of the banished king and Indra that of the one in power, and the offering is to free oneself from what pertains to Varuṇa, for as in RV. X. 124. 8 “the people who elect a King stand aloof in horror from Vṛtra” (vādo aś rāṣṭraṁ vyānaḥ bhūkatāvato āpi viśṛṅcāt aśrayhan), incidentally an interesting reference to the part of the people in the choice of the King: that the
"unfriend": "that which is of Mitra is not of Varuṇa" (SB. III. 2. 4. 18), "the Regnum takes no delight in the Sacerdotium" (SB. XIII.

reference of "Vṛtra" here is to a nature from which as regards its evil the King is to be purged, but which as regards its force is to remain in him (just as the gods retain the śāṁyāth of the Asuras), can be seen from PR.XVI. 4.1-5 and XVIII.9.6.7, where Indra puts on the lotus-wreath (vaiśeṣṭīavarāja) which his father Prajāpati (i.e. Varuṇa now succeeded by his son) had had made for himself "for the sake of supremacy" (śreyṣṭhyā)—it is "wrought of the arrows and all his offspring," its twelve flowers are the months, it is the "royal force" (indrīṇas viryam) of the Year, Prajāpati, Varuṇa—and "when he put on the lotus wreath, it is the Regnum, the very form (or aspect) of Vṛtra, that he puts on." (vaiśeṣṭīvarāja tad rūpaṃ kṣatram pratīmačate), that Vṛtra whom, as we are reminded in the same verse, he has already slain. The Dragon-slayer assimilates the Dragon's power but not his malice, and inherits his treasure, so that Vṛtra says to Indra: "Thou art now what I was erst." (SB. I. 6. 3. 17).

Thus indeed Indra "supersedes" the father (Varuṇa, Dyaus, Prajāpati, or Vṛtra) whom he has overcome or more strictly speaking "sacrificed"; the pseudo-historical legend of his namesake Ajātāśatru is another recension of the same story. But to think of this "supersession of Varuṇa by Indra" as the reflection of some doctrinal "evolution," or even to say that "Varuṇa was divested of his supreme powers by the time of the AV" (Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, pp. 65, 66) is a misapplication of "historical method" and only displays the mythologist's ignorance of theology. For Indragni are liberators above all else: they bring forth their people from captivity into a promised land. And every such soteriology necessarily transfers the Kingdom, whether by conquest or by a sacrificial atonement, from a "wretched Father" to a milder Son, from the God sābra to the God sā extra, in so far as a distinction can be made between them. So Christ says: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." (Matth. XXVIII. 18). What is true for the genealogy regni dei is true in every human lineage; the Prince who comes to the throne "supersedes" his father (whether he has been ritually "despatched" or has died by natural causes) and inherits his power (SB. V. 4. 2. 10), but establishes a new order. In this connection it is highly significant that one of the first acts of a new King, celebrating his accession, is a release of prisoners from jail. It is thus that Varuṇa, when his forceriness has been appeased, releases Sunahsena (RV. I. 24. 11-13). It is also true for the "people" that the son "supersedes" the father and inherits his rank, as in Kaus. U. II. 15 (10) where if the father who has made the last "bequest" by which the transmission and delegation of all his powers to his son is effected should recover, he can no more resume these powers than if he were actually dead, but must live subject to his son, or as a religious mendicant. The "supersession" of Varuṇa by Indra, or rather by the twins (yamā, RV. VI. 59. 2) Indragni, is an ontological, not an historical event.

The proceeding Agni in RV. X. 124 leaves himself behind at the same time that he goes forth, as also in RV. III. 55. 7 where "he proceeds in front and still remains within his ground" (dhā tva agrahā śasati kṣetī bhusanāḥ); "the Son remains within as essence and goes forth as Person... the divine nature steps forth into relation of otherness... other, but not another, for this distinction is rational,
in the Indian Theory of Government

The "two Agnis" are the same as those of TS. V. 2. 7. 6, AB. III. 4 and SB. II. 3. 2. 10, one whose form is that of Varuna and "deadly to be touched," and the other "whom one approaches, making him Mitra" (mitraक्रियेवोपितसते). They are the Agni "tied up," who as Varuna may attack the Sacrificer, and the Agni whose "unloosing" disperses the wrath (meni) of Varuna (TS. V. 1. 5. 9, V. 1. 6. 1). The two Agnis correspond not only to Indra and Agni, Regnum and Sacerdotium, but to the two possibilities of the Sacerdotium itself: for "the Purohita is (originally) Agni Vaiśvānara of the five wraths." (puṣicament), and if he be not "offered to, pacified and endeared" he repels the Sacrificer "from the world of Heaven, from the Regnum, might, realm and subjects," so that the King is well advised to make a Mitra, a "Friend," of him.—"He that is friendly with such an one, that King routs him who hates him" (tasya rājā mitram bhavati dvīsantam apabādhate) (AB. VIII. 24. 25 and 27).

not real" (Eckhart, Evans ed., I. 268). Nor is there any inconsistency in that, having "chosen" Indra, Agni invites his father Varuna to "Come forth to be the ruler of my Kingdom." (RV. X. 124. 5), for Varuna is Indra (RV. IV. 42. 3) as much as he is Agni, and the Rājusāya is "Varuna's Quickening," or regeneration.

Agni is Ahir Budhnya ab intra and Agni Gārhapatya ab extra (AB. III. 30, KB. XVI. 7, cf. VS. V. 33). RV. abounds with references to Agni's cathonic origins from his "ground" (budhaṇa, e.g. IV. I. 11. sā jāyata prathamāḥ... budhāḥ = V. 3. 1 teṣām agne vairao jāyate)—a "ground" amongst the waters—or from the "rock" (adri), the "stone" (aṃsa), or "mountain" (pareate).

In connection with the "fear" and "love" of Varuna it should be remembered that "Nothing prevents one and the same thing being loved under one aspect and hated under another" (St. Thomas Aquinas, Sum. Theol. I. 26. 2. ad 4).

Or five missiles" (Keith) to be identified, in the last analysis with the "five arrows" of Kāmaudeva, bearing in mind that Love and Death, Kāma and Mṛtyu, are one and the same Person.

It is not of his own power, but inasmuch as "God is with him" that the Kṣatriya is victorious; he says, accordingly: "I destroy the unfriends and lead forth my own subjects with the help of the Spiritual Power" (ekṣṇīṃ brāhmaṇa-mitrān amṇayāṃ svedas, VS. XII. 82 and SB. VI. 6. 3. 15), of which RV affords innumerable instances in the cooperation of Agni-Bṛhaspati with Indra against the Asuras. We propose to show that the archetype of the Unfriend or Unfriends, so often referred to in the texts as "he whom we hate and who hateth us," and as the "loveless brotherhood" (āpriyam bhrātṛvyam) are primarily and in most cases Vṛtra-Varuna-Mṛtyu and the Asuras generally. In SB. IV. 3. 3. 5 "the evil, hateful brotherhood" (pāpīṃde dvīsate bhrātṛvyāya) is explicitly Vṛtra; in JUB. I. 7. 2 the "evil brotherhood," to be excluded "mentally" from any share in these worlds, can only be, so to say, Satan. He has accomplished the purpose of the Sacrifice who "has slain his Vṛtra" (TS. II. 5. 4. 5). So that while it is beyond question that the Purohita sometimes assists, or rather enables, the King to overcome human enemies, the fundamental conflict is "not against flesh and
The marriage in JUB. I. 53-55 is not explicitly one of the Sacerdotium and Regnum, but of principles that are their equivalents in other contexts.

blood, but against the principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world" (Eph. VI. 12). When it is a question of human enemies, these are assimilated to the Adversary himself, and the weapons effective against him are turned against them; war, from the traditional point of view, being no more than any other vocational activity, a merely profane engagement (see note 72).

The "brotherhood" (bhārata) that is synonymous with emnity. (and to be distinguished from brotherliness, bhārata, in a favorable sense, RV.VIII.83.8, cf. X.23.7) is, then, the relationship of the Asuras to the Devas, of the Varuṇa who is "not Mitra" but āmītra, Unfriend, to Agni, Mitra, the Friend. Varuṇa is Agni's "elder brother" in RV.IV.1.2: "Turn thou, O Agni, thine elder brother Varuṇa toward * the Sun, support of men, the King, support of men" (ās bхārataṁ ēdunam agra ā vaceṣtva ... jyeṣṭhaṁ ... ādityāṁ caraṇādhitām, rājānāṁ caraṇādhitām, where ādityāṁ is the accusative of the person turned to, like mā in SB.IV.1.4.4 āpa mācārtava). This in only the special case of the general rule that the elder brothers of the Devas (BU.XIII.1 kāṇīyava eva devā, jyeṣṭha āsuraḥ; Mbh. XII.33.25 āsura bhāratau jyeṣṭha devā cāpi yoviṣṭhaḥ), and of the principle that the "brotherhood" of "those who hate one another" is that of the Devas and Asuras (TS.VI.4.10.1). It is significant that the root in jyeṣṭha is jye, with the primary meaning to "oppress," distinctly preserved in RV.VII.80.6 āsti jyeṣṭhaṁ kāṇīyaṁ upārā, "the elder is at hand to hurt the younger" (the reference being to Varuṇa himself, āpāṣyati in SB.V.3.4.31): it is, in fact, the rule in folklore that the elder brothers or sisters oppress the younger brother who is always the solar hero, or younger sister who is always the bride of a solar hero.

It will be noticed that RV.IV.1.2 cited above is rather "entropia" than apotropia, and that ā vaceṣtva, like āpa mācārtava, is essentially an invitation to union, samāśritya: the opposite of āyṛt, to "turn to," is vireṭ, to "turn apart," as in RV.VII.80.1 vicertāyantāṁ rājaṁ "divorcing Sky and Earth," and SB. VII.12 samśrīṁ vicertāyati, "disjoins the grammatical fusion of syllables" (in a sanskrit text, the marriage of words being thought of as analogous to that of Sky and Earth, and thus life-giving, āyṛga, ib. VIII.11). The "entropy" of our texts thus annuls the "divorce" of Sky and Earth, Essence and Nature, that takes places at the "creation," or rather manifestation or utterance, of the worlds, as in RV.VII.80.1 where the Light of Dawn "divorces the conterminous regions (Sky and Earth), makes manifest the several worlds" (vicertāyantāṁ rājaṁ adhmane, ārunyakṣavatāṁ bhūvanāṁ cādnt, cf. RV.VI.32.2 and SB.IV.6.7.9 (we remark in passing that the separation of the conjoint principles by Light, usually that of the early-waking or early-kindled Agni, is the motive in the equivalent story of Purāṇas and Uṛvaśi, SB.XI.5.1.4, and in that of Eros and Psyche). Ā vaceṣtva, then, is a prayer for the Asura's conversion (cf. W. N. Brown, "Preselytising the Asuras," JAOS 39, 1919), as in RV.I.25 where Varuṇa's wrath is deprecated and his mercy landed, and AB.III.4 where Agni's Varuṇya form is "deadly to be touched" (cf. JUB.II.14) and "one should

* Or possibly, "turn thyself toward."
The marriage is of the Two Worlds, referred to as "abodes" (āyatanāṁ): "In the beginning This (all) was twofold, Being (sat) and Non-being

approach him only having made him Mitra." (mitraṇaṁ eva prāyaṁ), which is possible inasmuch as "As one approaches him, so he becomes" (yathā-pathopādaste tād eva bhave), SB. X. 5. 2. 20). In the same way "Soma was Vṛtra" (SB. IV. 4. 3. 4), "Soma when tied up is Varuṇa" and "saying, 'Come forth as Mitra' (mitrō na āhī) he (the Priest) makes what is of Varuṇa's nature to be of Mitra's." (yadv vāruṇoḥ aśtu matrāṁ karotī, TS. VI. 1. 11. 1-2), as also in SB. III. 3. 3. 10, quoting VS. IV. 27, where Soma is besought to come forth as Mitra (mitrō na āhī); that is to say "Have mercy upon us, O Lord." In SB. III. 3. 4. 30 where "Soma is now of Varuṇa's nature," he is besought "not to slay our men (deśṛṇāṁ as in RV. I. 91. 19) or do evil"; the ritual slaying of Soma himself, essential to his kingship, is called a "slaughter of his evil, not of himself" (SB. III. 9. 4. 17-18). The Adhyāya Soma draught, drawn "from the tied up Soma, for (his) liberation" in the symbol of "Prajāpati the Liberator" (atimāṇi) and, by analogy, the human Sacrificer and Comprehensor, who is no less than Soma himself the victim and has died with Soma as such, "is wholly liberated from the evil brotherhood" (āti pāpaśāṁ bhrātyarṇaṁ muṣyate, TS. VI. 6. 9. 2): and here it is unmistakable that the "evil brotherhood" does not refer to any human adversary but to the Vṛtra-Varuṇa nature that was in Soma and in the Sacrificer's "old man."

Soma is not destroyed by his "death," but "made to go alive to the world of heavenly-light," and in the same way the Sacrificer by his death with Soma goes alive to the world of heavenly-light (TS. 68); furthermore, "he gains through him (Soma) this All, and there is no slayer, no deadly shaft for him by whom this All has been gained" (SB. III. 3. 4. 9), that is to say he wins the "human immortality" here and "incorruptible immortality" hereafter, as explained in note 35.

Although our immediate problem has been that of the identification of the "evil brotherhood," we cannot refrain from pointing out here that there are the closest possible parallels between the Indian and the Christian sacrifices, and that the Indian doctrine is not merely like, but, with only the substitution of the "Agni" for "Christ" (a merely nominal difference),** identical with that of Rom. VI. 5-9: "For if we have been planted together (σπέρμα, for which Liddell and Scott's first meaning is "born with one," I.e. coborn, σαφές, σαφος, and of the same parentage) (with him) in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified (sacrificed) with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we might not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more (σαμ ομοιοί πομός = ομοίως μισθός), death hath no more dominion over him." "Planted together" is of particular interest here, and might better have been rendered by "sown together": we recognize the usual symbol of agriculture, in which wohn is the field into which

*As "Prajāpati was Rohita," AV. XIII. 2. 39.

**In this connection the etymological equivalence of ṣaṁṣā and ṣhaṭti is not without interest.
(asat) both. Of these two, the Being is the Chant, the Intellect, Spira-
tion (ādīma, manaś, prāṇa); the Non-being is the Verse, the Voice,
the man, whether in natural or in supernatural generation, sows himself, and
from which he springs up again (John XII. 24, "Except a corn of wheat fall into
the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit").
Now, just as the natural insemination is a death and a regeneration (JUB. III.
8.10 and 9.1, etc.), so is the supernatural, where the sacrificial fire is the womb
and it is inasmuch as the Sacrificer "inseminates himself" (ādīmanā śiśceti)
therein that he comes to birth in yonder Sun and is possessed of two selves
dvāpānās, JB.I.17.6, cf. AB.V.29 and SB.VII.2.1.6), of which the second
is, of course, the "new man," the sajām ādīmanā of SB.IV.3.4.5. And just as
in natural generation the newborn son is a rebirth of the father, so here that
"other self" of the "new man" is a regeneration of the "old man" that was
sacrificed ("made holy") together with the deity, who is the sacrifice. It is the
"old man's" evil, not himself that is slain; the "death of the soul" is not a
destruction of anything but its evil, nothing but the annihilation of what is
already negative; in the agricultural symbolism it is only the husk of the grain
that is left behind, not the germ that springs up again. The new man that thus
springs up is at once the son of the old man and a son of God; and it is with
reference to the first of these affiliations (both implied by St. Paul's ἐνέκτο
that Eckhart, distinguishing the accidental features of the natural man from the
essence of the other and new man, says that "He who sees me, sees my child"
(Evans, I.408; Pfeiffer, p. 593). But to see that Self requires other eyes than
those of the flesh (cf. Hermes, LB.XIII.3 and S.I.23).

To return to "Varuṇa and what is Varuṇya": it is Varuṇa that seizes
(graṁati) the sick man (TS.II.3.11.1, V.2.1.3; AB.VII.15), the Sacrificer's
children (TS.VI.6.5.4, MS.I.10.2, SB.II.3.2.10) and "whatever is seized by the
Evil One"—or "by evil"—(yaś pāmrnān grāhitā bhoodati, SB.XII.7.2.17),
i.e. Indra's mortal enemy, "the overweening foe" (abhīśati) of TS.II.2.5,
cf. RV.VI.31.3; and it is inasmuch as he thus "sieves" that he is "the Siezer"
graha, JUR.IV.1.7, etc.), an epithet of sinister connotation and a synonym of
mokṣa = śūnumā and jhūja (Viśvās, to injure). It is with the "noose of
Order" (ptāvajātā pāsena) that one binds (pratīmaṇcati) the sacrificial victim,
and "that cord is Varuṇa's" varuṇa yād eva yād rūpyaṁ, SB.III.7.4.1). The
Vedas, e.g. RV.I.24.11, I.25.1.2, abound with the fear of Varuṇa and the
depression of his murderous wrath; the wages of sin is death and vengeance is
his, to repay. In SĀ.XII.21 and 25 we find an amulet worn by the Sacrificer
"in order that the celestial Varuṇa (dīrva varuṇa, i.e. Dyana, varuṇa dyāra
[ea in RV.VII.87.6] may not strike fear into him (naṁnaḥ ... Kante bhītām)
... and Varuṇa does not slay him in his pride, neither does the mokṣa, or graha or
śūnumāra hurt him." On the other hand, the sacrifice of the peace-offering has been
made, when the Asura has been "converted" and "made a Friend of," then it is not
"Varuṇa" but the mītra personum of Mitāru Varuṇa that accepts the Sacrificer
(RV.I.23.6): "By means of Mitra he (the priest) appeases (śūnumati, slays, sacrifies) Varuṇa for him (the Sacrificer) ... sets him free (muṣceti) from
Varuṇa's noose, so that even if his life be almost gone (yādi Tāsur bhūdati, not
Keith's "if his life be gone" but "if be becoming gone") he verily lives." (TS.

* Cf. "abhīśatā devo varuṇaḥ," Śāyuṇa on RV.I.89.3. Agni and Indra, per
contra, are suṣmanas, RV. paseim.
Expiration (ṛc, rāc, apāna). She, this Verse, desired intercourse with (mithunin) with him, the Chant. He asked her: ‘Who art thou?’

II.1.9.3: and in the same way that the royal Sacrifice himself, assimilated to Prajāpati (the atimokṣiṣṭ of TS.VI.6.9.2), and by means of the barley offering, “delivers his children (subjects) from Varuṇa’s noose (ṛṣṭāḥ varunāpaśāṭ prāmuṇācaḥ), and those children of his are born sound and sinless (mā asāyānmane śūkkibhāṣ prajāḥ prajāyante), saying: ‘It is in order that my children may be born sound and sinless that I would be quickened.’” (aḥāssyaḥ, SB.V.2.4.2; V.2.5.16), cf. RV.X.07.16 varunāyāḥ. . . . yamāṇya pānādaṃ sātrasmad daeva-kilbiṣṭaḥ, where the assimilation of Varuṇa to Yama is unmistakeable, and we see also why it is that the Prince must be reborn to the Kingship, and for what he aspires to dominion.

As to the “barley-offering” we learn from KB.V.3 that when Prajāpati’s children “have been expressed” (ṣṛṣṭāḥ) but are still unquickened (aprasūṣṭaḥ, not viable, not alive, unborn, cf. as jāyante in Avyaka U, VI.1, JAOS. 60.349) but “are eating of Varuṇa’s barley” (varunāyāḥ yaśaḥ caḥṣaḥ), it is Varuṇa that “ Restrains them with his nooses” (varunāḥ varunāpākṣaḥ pratyamanuṣcas), and that it is only when he has been “endearèd” (prītaḥ, i.e. made a friend, mitra) that he frees them from these nooses of Varuṇa and all evil (varunāpākṣaḥ varunasmad ev pāpahesu prayah prāmuṇācaḥ). Varuṇa’s barley is the “pasturage” (yānasa) from which they who are like kine without a herdsman (ṛdye na . . . ṛdopāḥ), yet are intent upon (or trust) the Friend (abhi mitrāḥ citāgaḥ), escape (vyūḥ, RV.VII.18.5-10): these same “kine, led forth, east of the Arj’s (Indra’s) barley (ṛdye yām prāpatā arīḥ aksan); I have seen them as they came forth, (now) in a Herdsman’s care” (sudānopāḥ, RV.X.27.8). Varuṇa’s barley, the food of the unborn, suggests the “flask-pots of Egypt,” a correlation that corresponds to that of Varuṇa-Vṛtra with “Pharoah.” (My suggested rendering of citāgaḥ above by “who trust,” depends upon the fact that vīcīkaśu is the contrary of ēruddha, from which it follows that to “trust in” or “trow on” is a meaning that pertains to Veṣi, cf. cēyaḥ in RV.VI.1.25.)

We have elsewhere (JAOS 55.409-410) identified Varuṇa and the Varuṇya Agni with Ahi-Vṛtra-đuṇṣa-Namucī, and these with the Pharaoh of Ezekiel XXIX. 3, “The great dragon that lieth in the midst of the rivers, which has said, My river is my own, and I have made it for myself.” Pithrāṃ jahāmi in RV.X.124.4 makes of the Aūra Father, who is also the “elder brother” (pitā, jyesṭhaḥ bhṛtā ev; Sāyuṇa on RV.X.20.7), an “Ahi” in the sense of JB.III.77 yad ahiyaḥ, tad ahiṁsa ahiṣteva; and actually, the prior and fiercer form, which Agni abandons when he is kindled, is an Ahi (Ahi Budhnyā, AB.III.36, KB.XVI.7, Ahi Dhuni, RV.I.79.1).

Varuṇa and Vṛtra derive alike from Vṛ to “cover” and “restrain” (Nirukta, X.3: Grassmann, Wörterbuch; and cf. RV.VI.75.18 uṝr vṝṣṇo vṝṣṇo, VII.82.6: where Varuṇa prā vṛṣṇi; Sāyuṇa’s gloss on RV.I.89.3 “vṛṣṇi śravatiḥ pāśāḥ eva ṛṣṇiti, ṛṣṇi ahiṁśāḥ devo vṛṣṇaḥ;” and GB.I.7, varuṇa as Varuṇa): i.e., inasmuch as Mitra is the Day and Varuṇa the Night, the Darkness (TS.II.1.7.4; TB.I.1.7.10, cf. Mādhava on TS.I.8.16.1), i.e. “Evil, Death” (TS.V.7.5.1, AB.IV.5), “Nous sommes ainsi amenés à assimiler Varuṇa, non pas aux vainqueurs des démons, mais aux démons eux-mêmes . . . c’est l’aspect sévère de la divinité, que so nom accueille par avance” (Bergaigne, La religion védique,
She answered: ‘I am She’ (śīham asmi). ‘Then, indeed, am I He.

III.115) “The epithet asura is ... specially applicable to Varuṇa” (Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p. 24), as is that of Deva to Savitṛ.

It is in connection with the withholding of the waters by Varuṇa and their release by Indra that the assimilation of Varuṇa to Śuṣṇa and Vṛtra is most apparent; we must not be confused by the fact that, when associated with Mitra, Varuṇa becomes a “rain-god.” It is to Varuṇa that stagnant waters pertain, for they are “seized” (ṛṣṭa) by him as their grāha, while it is the flowing waters, “living waters,” divine and fit for sacrificial use that Indra frees from Vṛtra. (TS.VI.4.2.3, SB.IV.4.5.10, etc.). The opposition of Indra to Varuṇa and the assimilation of the latter to Vṛtra are conspicuous in AV.III.13.1-2 where the waters “go forth together (saṃprapatāḥ) when Ahi is smitten (āḥau ... ānte).” When sent forth by Varuṇa (yēt prēṣṭaḥ vāraṇaṇa)... then Indra obtained you.” (tad āṇḍaḥ indro eva) and it is evident that Varuṇa only releases the waters when he, Ahi, has been smitten. Another, and rather remarkable evidence for the equation Vṛtra = Varuṇa is afforded by a correlation of SB.II.6.6.18-19 (cf. KBR.III.5) with SB.II.4.4.17-19. In the first of these passages the solar Indra swallows up the lunar Vṛtra on the “night of cohesion” (saṃcāsaṇa, new moon night). In the last, the light Moon is Varuṇa, the dark Moon Mitra (so called by assimilation, in accordance with SB.X.6.2.1 where, in connection with Sun and Moon, it is explicit that the eaten is called by the name of the eater) and these two being a couple (mithunam), Mitra (the Sun) insinuates Varuṇa (the Moon). From this it follows also that Vṛtra-Varuṇa is Indra-Mitra’s wife; a conclusion by no means at variance with Varuṇa’s femininity elsewhere or with the equation of Vṛtra and kṣetra in PB.XVIII.9.6, and notably in agreement with RV.X.55.29 “Potentiality (kṛṣṇa) hath gotten feet. (i.e., put off her ophidian nature; cf. I.152.3 and III.35.14), and as a wife inhabits (dā ... cāte, cf. JUB.I.33.6 dālyāṃ praviśati) her Lord.” “(the Sun). We see again that marriage is a reconciliation of hostile principles, involving the death (and regeneration) of the enemy as such; that there are more ways than one of “killing” a dragon; and that the rājra (thunderbolt) being a “shaft” of light, and “light the progressive power” (TS.VII.1.1.1) (prācīnāṃ motus et viāte). Wittelo, Lib. de intelligentiā IX, etc.), the piercing of Vṛtra is also a fertilisation, to be equated with that of the “lightning-smitten” Semele by Zeus.

The Varuṇa into whose maw the Seven Rivers flow (RV.VIII.69.12) is the Varuṇa that lies in wait against the current of the river, to seize the Sacrificer’s children (the subjects of the King) (TS.VI.6.5.4), the “Infanticide.” (śīṃśakā or -māra), Indra’s enemy, who lies against the current with yawning jaws ready to seize the Sacrificer himself, and must be appeased (PB.VIII.6.8, XIV.5.15; JB.I.174, III.193); the dissipation of this same śīṃśakā by Indra, who forces him upstream (cf. the apotropaic pānuśārṣas in AV.IV.11.2 pratikālaṃ in X.1.7 and pratīcessa in SB.XII.30) onto the dry land where he “is left, as it were” (khīna iva, cf. JB.III.77 cited above) and his subsequent resurrection when he praises Indra who then enables him to return to the sea (JB.III.173), as in the “Flood Legend.” Manu rescues the tiny Jhāsa and enables it to return to the sea. (SB.I.8.1.6), and as in the Alexander legend (see Ars Islamicā, I, 1934, pp. 177-178), narrates in other words the inveteration and rejuvenation, death and resurrection, of Cyavāna, Prajāpati, Varuṇa.
(aham amo 'smi), he replied. What 'She' (sā) is and what 'He' (ama),

Notable for Varuṇa's connection with death is the fact that the cracking of the axle of the bodily vehicle is a sign of death (BU. IV. 3.35), and when the axle cracks, this "is Varuṇa of the evil voice" (durekā, TS. VI. 2.8.1; cf. JUB. I. 52.8); that he is addressed as "sweet-voiced" (sunakkī) is "to pacify him" (ādityaḥ, ś.) and corresponds to the "making him Mitra" in other contexts. It is an Asura that speaks in the cracking axle (SB. III. 5.3.17), a Rākṣasa that infests the car (TS. V. 2.2.3), whereas Agni's car is silent (RV. I. 74.7). It is repeatedly stated that what is "ill-sounding" (apadhruvatam, JUB. I. 52.8, CU. II. 22.1) pertains to Varuṇa; and this agrees with the distinction of īṣṭa-vra from brahma as that of the toneless (cacophonous) re from the chanted and harmonious sāman. Whatever is inauspicious, inadequate, or evil is referred to Varuṇa (TS. VI. 6.7.3; cf. VII. 3.11.1 yoh āvāda dvēṣṭaḥ, or to Trita (RV. VIII. 47.13, 14) who as Agni ab ātra, the Varuṇya Agni, is Varuṇa (RV. VIII. 41.6).

If Agni and Soma "when constricted" (upasaddha) are of Varuṇa's nature, this agrees with the close connection of nooses (pāśa), bonds (buddha, dāman), and knots (granthi) with Varuṇa. Thus the knot is inauspicious and distinctively Varuṇa's (SB. I. 3.1.18, V. 2.5.17, etc.), the "untying of Agni" is a dissipation of Varuṇa's wrath (TS. V. 1.6.1); while on the other hand Indra is the archetype (cf. JIISOA, Dec. 1935, pp. 5-6) of that Mahāvīra, Jina, and Tirthakara ("Great Hero," "Conqueror," and "Finder"); for the last epithet cf. RV. VII. 18.3 where śadra gābdān akṛṣṭa, and further references in W. N. Brown, Walking on the Water whose followers are expressly Nirgranthas, "Freed of the Knot," surely that "knot of īṣṭa's that Indra resolves" (vi āvāpaṇa āditya-granthiṣṭam... evaḥ, RV. X. 61.13), the Gordian knot that Soma is enjoined to untie in RV. IX. 97.18, and all those knots that are called "Knots of the Heart." Now what is it to be freed from the knot? In the first place, to be released from Varuṇa's noose so as to be born and to receive a name and shape (nāmarūpa). But this is only a loosening, not an unloosening of the knot; for names themselves are knots (AA. I. 6), and "everything here is gripped by name" (nāma... prahitaṁ, SB. IV. 6.5.3). To be wholly "freed of the knot" is to be released from "name and shape," and to have "gone home" (Mund. U. III. 2.8 nāmāsādād vimuktaḥ purṛtaśāṁ aparīti ātmyaḥ, Sn. 1074 nāmakhyād vimutti attham pauleti). The foregoing is far from exhaustive of the material relative to Varuṇa's evil nature, i.e. to the Divine Majesty, or Wrath of God, considered apart from the Divine Mercy, to the Divine Darkness considered apart from and as opposed to the Divine Light, to Non-being and Unreality as logically distinguished from Being and Reality. It has been shown what is the nature of the "hostile brotherhood" from which the Regnum in alliance with the Spiritual Authority redeems itself in the Sacrifice.

We must, at the same time briefly indicate that the whole conception is reversible, for what is "night" from the human point of view is "day" from that of the sage (BG. II. 61), what seems untrue or unreal to men is true and real to the Gods, the way to heaven is countercurrent, the via affirmativa in which the aspects of deity are distinguished must be followed by the via negativa in which they are all one. Love and Death are one and the same power, and to one who knows how to approach him, "making him a friend" (mitrakṛtya), he is the friend, Mitra as much as he is Varuṇa, and we can ask impatiently: "When at last shall we come again to be in Varuṇa?" (RV. VII. 86.2); love casting out fear.
that makes 'Chant' (ātsamān), and this is the quiddity of the 'Chant.'** "Nay," said he, 'for thou art my sister, forsooth.'" She then continues to woo her brother, who at last consents (which is, of course, the "happy ending" to the abortive wooing of Yama by Yamī in RV. X.10).**

**This is the usual hermeneutic of ātsama. "That they (He and She, Sky and Earth) united (sametat) and brought forth the Chant is the quiddity of the Chant" (JUB. I.51.2, AB.III.23, etc.). "He" (ātsama) is in various contexts Agni, Vāyu, Āditya, Candra, kṣipra manus, ātsama, sat, ātsama; and "she" (ātsama) Iyam (Earth), Antarikṣa (Air), Dyaus (Sky)—the three "domains"—mahatātā, sākṣi, apāna, etc., kṣipra, kṣipra (cf. BU. I.4.17); sat, etc. (JUB. I.53, CU.I.6.7, etc.); and all these are aspects of the Sacerdotium and Regnum respectively.

**JUB. in terms of Sky and Earth, brother and sister, supplies the "happy ending" to Yama's abortive wooing by Yamī in RV. X.10, where, for example, anāyam itchaḥputam . . . pātim in verse 10 corresponds to anāyam itkhamān itchaḥputam in JUB. I.53.6. "Yama's" rejection of "Yamī" represents only one side of the mutual "horror" of one another felt by the conjoint principles, divided āb ātatra, and because of which "she" shrinks from "him" as often and as much as he from her, at the same time that each desires the other. All this pertains to the archetypal "psychology of sex." The pattern of Indian ontology—śūkṣma as puryaṭipātadakam or svyaṭipātadakam brahmaṇam, Sāyana on SB.XI.3.6.8, i.e. the bhāvabhūta hymna of RV.—is immeasurably less multifarious than has been supposed by those who consider "only the names" (S.I.11). In the last analysis, "The Mother and the Father and the Child are this All." (SA. VII.15), "this Earth is the womb of Everything" (SB.IV.1.2.8), Eve is the "mother of all living" (Gen.II.20). The stories of Siva and Pārvatī in the Rāmāvamśa and that of Purūravas and Urvāru in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa are just as much as the legend of Yama and Yamī versions of one and the same Liebesgeschichte Himmels.

Who then are Yama and Yamī? We propose to show that they are not sui generis, but Sky and Earth, Day and Night, Indrāgni, the Āśvins, the Sacerdotium and Regnum, damsāt and all other devadevas. As a preliminary to this argument we must point out that "Yama" alone means "twins" (du); i.e. Yama and Yamī, just as Sūna is Sūna and Re, Prajāpati and ātsama and ēc, Agni both brahma and kṣatra, and patipāt one in the single androgynous Person before their schism: and that duals such as pitarōva, mātāra, devadāsī are no more than jātsamās in RV.X.10 necessarily couples of one and the same sex but nearly always pairs of opposite sex, "father and mother" (cf. damsāt), "brother and sister," etc. Thus in RV.III.54.7 where Sky and Earth are svadeva, I.188.3 where they are svadeva jāti pitarōva upadānī, and I.129 where they are explicitly a Father and a Mother, whose respective natures are those of manas, "Intelligent," and svadeva = daksā, "Power," having a progeny (prajā), but also referred to as mātāra, "parents," and as jāti sāyost manah sāmakoḥ, "uterine twins, consorts cohabitant"; it is obvious that svadeva and jāti can only be "twin brother and sister," and at the same time impossible not to recognize the Yama and Yamī of RV.X.10.4.5 paraśām jāti tān na ... garbha ... damsāt. In RV.VIII.60.1 the reference of mātāra is not to Agni's "mothers" but to his "parents," the firesticks, which are always thought of as male and female and
When the consummation is about to take place, the well-known words of
may be addressed as Pururavas and Urvashi, and similarly in RV. VI. 40.2 that of
yuvatīśa is not to "two young mothers" but to Father Sky and Mother Earth.
In RV. VI. 59.2 Indrāṇī are hārītārā... yasvā which can be taken to mean
"twin brothers" from one point of view, but equally "twin brother and sister." when
the relation of brahma to kṣetra is emphasized; tho in the same verse the
ākāśātārā are not the usual "parents" but "two mothers, here and there"
on whom Indrāṇī are begotten by their one Father (these "mothers," Śāyana's
Aditi and Earth, are Eckhart's "Mary ghostly and Mary in the flesh"). It is
strange that much of this should have been overlooked by Hopkins (JAOS 16.
cxvi) and others who, while always ready to render piteras and mātārās by
"parents" (m. and f.) invariably render svasrā by "sisters," regardless of the
fact that the relationship of Sky to Earth is never that of sister to sister or
brother to brother, but that of brother to sister, father to daughter, and husband
to wife.

Yama, who is regularly identified with Agni, may take Agni's place as coborn
twin (yasvā ha jāta śindrēśa sarha, Nirukta, X. 21), Indra then clearly replacing
Yami, Earth, as Yama's bride (6B VII. 2.1.10, "Yama is Agni, Yami the
Earth"), quite in agreement with AB. III. 38 where "Indra is This (Earth)...the
King of Beings is This (Earth)," and AV. XIV. 1.48 where the Earth is
Agni's bride.

The Aśvins, another pair of twins, may be another form of the two pairs
already mentioned and collated. It can hardly be doubted that the Aśvins, twins
"born here and there, one of ye Sumakha's lordly conqueror, the other Subhaga,
son of Sky" (ākāśa jātā... jēṣav vām anayāḥ sūmakhāya sārīr, dīc anayāḥ
subhagāḥ putrāḥ, RV. I. 181.4), must be identified with the twins Indrāṇī
"whose mothers are here and there" (ākāśātārā, RV. VI. 59.2), and of whom
one in his capacity as Mahāvira and Jina is certainly "Good Makha's conqueror"
(or Sacrificer, Makha being the Sacrifice, and sārīḥ implying Mahayan; see the
fuller references in JAOS 55. 377-382), and the other as the Sun certainly "Good
Bhaga." That the Aśvins ride in a common chariot (rathyēvas... yasvā, RV.
II. 39.2, samadgoyāh hi vām rathāḥ, I. 30.18) again suggests Indrāṇī (sarga-
thānāh tāsthādāhā, RV. I. 108.1, samād... rāthe, VI. 59.5) and likewise Kṛṣṇa
and Arjuna (BG. cf. note 4). That the Aśvins are referred to in RV. II. 39.1
and 3 as "two Brahmās" (brahmadād) and as "two Sakras" (sakrā, cf. Nirukta
XII. 1, vājāna) may well be an allusion to Indrāṇi who are both "priests"
(indī ero brahmā, RV. VIII. 14.7, cf. 6B. IV. 6.6.5, JU. I. 45.1) and both "kings"
(indrā na agni... vajrāna... dīc, RV. VI. 59.3, etc.); the emendation sakrā for
the sakrā of RV. II. 39.3 is quite unnecessary, however plausible in view of
RV. X. 10.7 where Yama and Yami are "two wheels" (i.e. Sky and Earth, Day
and Night, Manas and Vāc, as wheels of the cosmic and sacrificial chariot, cf.
RV. I. 30.19, VIII. 89.4, AB. V. 30.33, JU. I. 20.3, III. 16.1-2, 6B. II. 3.3.12,
etc.). The Aśvins are again sakrā in RV. X. 24.4-5, where Śāyana is absolutely
right in referring samāt, "the conjoint" (Sky and Earth), to the Aśvins them-
soever and in saying that nirmanantaham, "ye churned," has for its object an
implied agnim; that they thus bring Agni to birth is "at the prayer of the
Joyless" (vismād), i.e. "for the sake of Ātri-Vimāda" (ātrya... vismadgāya,
RV. I. 51.3), cf. Trīta's (Agni's, trīta gāhyena evrtāna, RV. I. 168.3) appeals to
the marriage formula are uttered, "I am 'He,' thou art 'She'; thou

Sky and Earth in RV. I. 103, and Trita in the womb (RV. X. 46. 6): that is to say, then, at the prayer of Agni himself, as yet unborn but longing to be born, eager for the sacrificial role and choosing Indra for his ally, as in RV. X. 194. 3. 4. In RV. VI. 11. 1: where Agni is besought to "turn hitherward" (d... āsthyaḥ) Mitra-Varuṇa, the Aśvins, and Sky and Earth, these are not six different essences but three aspects of one pair; that the same deity may be referred to in one and the same context by different names, as was observed by Hopkins, Ep. Myth. p. 82, could be amply illustrated from RV., e.g. I. 32. 5 where vṛtra, ēśvan, and ēsī are not three different persons, and X. 62. 11 where the name of ēsī is the aśvapati of h, the reference being to Viśvasvati's son by Sanāyana's swatāpata, and by the same token to the Manu Viśvasva of RV. VII. 52. 1. II RV. III. 54. 7, speaking of Sky and Earth as "brother and sister" (vādevāḥ—like Zeus and Hera—) goes on to say that "they call each other by conjugal names" (vṛṣṇītāṁ vādevaṁ uddavaśa)—decandrapāṇa, as Sāyana says—these can only be any or all of the names appropriate to any pair of "mates" (vṛṣṇī) or any of the "pairs of opposites" (decandrapāṇa) such as the two chariot wheels, or day and night, or well-done and ill-done of Kauś. U. I. 4; in other words, just such dual names as are descriptive of the Aśvins in RV. II. 39, names that are equally applicable to Sky and Earth, Yama and Yamā, or Sacerdotium and Regina, or any other twin couples. In RV. II. 39 the Aśvins are compared to many such "pairs," of which some (vṛṣṇītāṁ, dāsvatā) are expressly and others (vṛṣṇītāṁ, ākṣi, vādeva, ēsī, ēsī, and kādaṁ = ēāyāvṛṣṇītā) parabolically of opposite sex. ēkād can as well be "King and Queen" and "two Kings" (this holds equally for vājraṇa in RV. X. 61. 23, where the reference is to Mitra and Varuṇa: who are, as we shall show, related to one another as man to woman). Ākṣi "two eyes," suggest the Sun and Moon, ēdīd... ākṣi in RV. I. 12. 10, respectively the god-world and man-world (JUB. III. 13. 12), or again Indra and Indrāṇi (SB. X. 5. 2. 11-16). Vṛṣṇītā and ēsī, the upper and the nether milestones and "upper and lower lip," are sometimes symbols of Sky and Earth; to which kādaṁ in any case refers. Vād, "two winds" or "two breaths," corresponds to prāvī, i.e. prāvīpaṇa, in TS. VI. 4. 9. 4, the two breaths that are so often equated with Mitra and Varuṇa: Sky and Earth, and considered male and female; Rao, Elements of Hindu Iconography, II. 543, speaks of a personification of the Aśvins as vṛṣṇī and ēsī. An equation of the Aśvins with Sky and Earth, Yama and Yamā, kṛṣṇa and kṣatra, suggests a sexual differentiation at least in principle. In this connection it may well be significant that the Egyptian Zodiacal "Twins," who correspond to the Greek Dioscuri with whom the Aśvins have often been equated, are explicitly and iconographically of opposite sex (Wallis Budge, Gods of the Egyptians).

That the Aśvins are regularly "saviours" (muceau, rakṣātā, tāruka) from bonds and fetters (baddha, pāda)—RV. II. 39. 6, AV. III. 7. 4, JB. III. 74, etc.—is their function as "physicians," because of which they are in need of purification (TS. VI. 4. 9. 12): just like the conjoint principles Sky and Earth, etc., whose elaborate purifications are described in JUB. I. 50-57 where it is impossible not to recognize that they are Yama and Yamā. RV. I. 109. 4 invokes Indrāṇi as "Aśvina," and we see no more reason to explain this away by saying that the word means only "horsemen" in this context than to argue that in RV. X. 61.
14-16, where Agni and Indra, Priest and King are called adātyaṇa, anything but the “Āvīna” is meant. RV. VII. 72. 3 identifies the Āvīna with Sky and Earth by apposition (rādass dhiṣyaṇe Ś. adātyaṇa, cf. VI. 11. 1 adātyaṇa dydeḥ puṣvīka).

There is a side of the problem connected with the birth of the Āvīna, to which we have so far merely alluded. We must bear in mind that the word Yama means “twins,” and therefore as Śāyuṣa clearly states, means Yama and Yami. Now Yama is born of the Sun (Vivasvat; in Mbb. XII. 208. 17, Mārtanda) and Tvasṭr’s daughter Saranyu, who forthwith made off (RV. X. 17. 1). This is evidently the same thing as the birth of Yama and Yami from their “parents” in RV. X. 10. 5, viz. from “the Gandharva in the Waters and the Maid of the Waters” (dīpī Ś. yāmī Ś. Apsaras = Saranyu) of RV. X. 10. 4. The Gods concealed the Immortal (bride) from mortals is another way of saying that she disappeared, as aforesaid; and they made her “like” or “double” (aṣṭarṇa) who bore the Āvīna, and we are told that Saranyu deserted “both mates” (dēd inithūn, RV. X. 17. 2, an indication I think of the Āvīna’s opposite sex, cf. RV. II. 38. 2 dēmātpita; but cf. Whitney on AV. XVIII. 2. 33 and Griffith’s version of RV. X. 17. 2). In BD. VI. 162 Yama and Yami are twins, Yama the “elder” (jyōga); Saranyu bears them, and then expressing (ṣaṣṭro) a woman “like” herself, entices the couple (percūna) to this pseudo-Saranyu and herself makes off in the form of a mare; unaware of the deception, Vivasvat begets Manu (Manu Vaiyavata, RV. VIII. 52. 1; Manu Sāvāṇi, RV. X. 62. 9, 11) on the pseudo-Saranyu, and then, realising what has happened, pursues the mare and begets the Āvīna, whose equine designation is thus explained.

We have thus to do with two, or three, pairs of “twins”; for Manu, “Man,” is as much as “Adam” a syāgya, and becomes the father of mankind by his “daughter” Parīśu (“Ribh,” RV. X. 83. 23) or Idā (SB. I. 8. 10, etc.). The other versions of the story are discussed by Bloomfield (JAOS 15. 172 ff.): the most noteworthy point in some of these is the term “shadow” (chāyā) used instead of the word “likeness” (aṣṭarṇa); in VP. III. 2 also, this “shadow” is the mother of Manu Sāvāṇi.

The expression “Shadow.” is significant, and enables us to make some interesting comparisons. In GB. I. 3 Brahma, having expressed the Waters, “sees his shadow in them” (tāṇa ardān chāyāṃ apiṣat), and his seed falls and is “supported” there; cf. the birth of Vasiṣṭha in RV. VII. 33. 11 and that of Vāmadeva in PB. VII. 8. 1, where parvāpāyātās corresponds to chāyāṃ apiṣat. The “Shadow” in the Waters is evidently the same as the Asparas, “she who moves in the Waters.” There are remarkable parallels in Egyptian and Greek mythology. The Egyptian ZoilaCast “Twins” mentioned above are the children of the solar Śū or Ter (Amen-Ra), whose “Shadow,” who is also Mother-Earth, is his wife (Budge, op. cit., I. 87 ff. and II. 315). The Greek Centaurs, who are certainly “horse-men,” are the children of Ixion (whose solar and, like Vivasvat’s, mortal nature, is indicated by the fact that he is bound to a revolving wheel,—a bhava-cakra) by a “cloud” in the “semblance” (sūnulavram) of Juno or Hera (see citations in Cook, Zeus III. 74 ff., especially Myth. Vat. 3. 4. 6 Ixion Junonis confugum petivit; ilia numen in specie aurumavit, cum qua Ixion coenit centauros genuit).
bhātvā, let us twain generate progeny (prajāh prajanāyāvahai); come,

Now it can hardly be doubted that all these births of different mothers, one immortal and the other a likeness or transformation of the first, are really the divine and human births that are predicated in various ways of every solar hero, e.g., Heracles, Agni, Buddha, Mahāvīra, Christ; of whom Heracles, son of Zeus by Alcmene, was made a legitimate son of Jupit; Agni is deimātā (RV. passim); Buddha was born of Māyā, who had been made “in the likeness of the other” (Zalitśa Vistara, Leumann p. 27, l. 12), i.e., born of “Māyā the daughter of Māyā” (AV.VIII.9.8), i.e., daughter of Aditi (Mother Earth) daughter of Aditi (mother of Gods), RV.VIII.35.2, and it is to be noted that Māyā “like every mother of a Bodhisattva” died early, that is, deserted the child, who was fostered by Pajāpattī; Mahāvīra, conceived by a boṣakaḥ, was born of a khattiyāni; while, as Eckhart says of Christ, “his birth of Mary ghostly was more pleasing to him than his birth of Mary in the flesh.” It will be observed that the temporal and eternal mothers are generally named alike, or in any case are alike. It is then in agreement with an established pattern that Saranyū, the daughter of Tvāṣṭṛ and to be identified with Śūryā, and her counterpart or transformation, are represented to be the immortal mother of Gods (Yama-Yami) and the mortal mother of the Āśvins (who were “not originally” Gods) and of “Men.” Considered from this point of view the births of Yama (Yama-Yami) and that of the Āśvins, who are respectively Sky and Earth ab āstra and Sky and Earth ab āstra, are not really, but only logically, two different births.

The whole story of Vivasvat and Saranyū is thus only a specialised variant of that of the Spiritual Person (ātman, puruṣa) whose “two halves” (pati-patā) are to be equated with Yama-Yami = Agni and Earth in SB.VII.2.1.10, and with the Egyptian Zodiacal “Twins” who are of opposite sex and are called the “two halves” of the one solar deity (Budge, loc. cit.), of which two halves the “wife” after giving birth to “Men” (manuṣyaḥ, patronymic of Manu and thus “the children of men”) reflects that “He produced me from himself, forsooth” ( mAṭman eva jñanam itvā, i.e., “I am his daughter”), conceals herself (cf., Cypria 8, where Nemesis “dislikes to lie in love with her father Zeus” and flies from him, assuming forms of fish and animals; and Heracleutus Aph. X, “Nature loves to hide”), and becomes a cow, a mare, “and so on down to the ants,” the Spiritual Person (ātman, puruṣa)—whom she cannot elude—assuming corresponding forms and engendering corresponding offspring (BU.I.4.1-4). The theme survives in folklore in ballads of the type of “The Two Magicians” (Child, English and Scottish Popular Ballads, Boston, 1904, no. 44) in which there occur such lines as “Then she became a duck, And he became a rose-kaimed drake,” and there can be no doubt that the “two magicians” are ultimately the Māyān (Sky and Earth, māyā and māyā) who couple and bring forth the Bhe (Agni) in RV.X.5.3, and equally the Māyīn Nāsātvan (Āśvins) who are Agni’s kindlers in RV.X.24.4-5, cited above.

It will follow from all that has been said above that SB.IV.1.5.16 is essentially correct in saying that the “Āśvins are manifestly (or exoterically, ab āstra) Sky and Earth.” If Yāsaka in turn explains them in more than one way,

* Hence, as Meister Eckhart says, “to find Nature as she is in herself, all her forms must be shattered.” An imitation of natural forms is not an “imitation of Nature.”
let us consort” (ea samhārasāvahāe). They became the Virāj (“Who knoweth her withunata?”, AV. VIII. 9. 10) and “brought forth (prājanāyataṁ) ‘Him who glows yonder’ (the Sun, the Sāma; the “Golden Person” of JUB. I. 48. 8); they ran apart (vyadāvatāṁ—

as Sky and Earth, Sun and Moon, Day and Night, or as Two Good Kings (Nirukta XII. 1, cf. XII. 10), this by no means implies, what Macdonell suggested, that “even the oldest commentators were puzzled” as to what the Āśinas were; on the contrary, the alternatives are valid examples of the “conjugal names” by which, as we have seen, the Āśinas can be “explained.” If we too cannot distinguish sharply between the three pairs of conjoint principles that are born of the Sun and Saranyā, Gandharva and Apsaras, whether as reality or shadow, this is not because we are “puzzled” but because the distinction between the Twins in divīnas, the cosmic twins, and the parts of the human syzygy is one of nature and not of essence. All these pairs are types of the Sacerdotium and the Regnum.

28 Cf. SB. X. 4. 1. 5, Agni and Indra. Sacerdotium and Regnum speaking, ekān rājasā udbhāva asvā, “let us twain become of one form” (with a view to procreation), cf. our “he made one flesh.” Sambhā, like eko dhā is to “be unified”; hence both expressions have a marital significance, but can also mean to “die,” marriage implying the trans-formation of the second party, by assimilation.

The word virāj (from rāj, to “shine” and “rule,” metaphysically coincident notions) is analogous to vihāma, “shining forth” and to sī “diffusing radiation”; any such shining being necessarily also a vihāsa, i.e., an extension of being in various directions, and thus “omnipresence”; whence also vihātā as “power” (cf. Ṛgveda, “proceed” and Ṛgveda, “authority”). Furthermore, “light is the progenitive power” (TS. VII. 1. 1. 1 and SB. VIII. 7. 1. 10), cf. Witelo, Lib. de intelligentiis, IX, Lax in omnia vincere est principium motus et vitæ. There can be no wonder that it is said of the Virāj (to he equated with Śrī and Greek Hecate, ἵκωρ meaning “far-shooting,” certainly with reference to “shafts of light”) that “he who gets the most thereof becomes the chief” (āreṣṭakaḥ, also “most glorious,” SB. XII. 6. 1. 40), cf. AB. VII. 15 “Behold the Sun’s Fortune” (suryāṣya paśya āreṣṭaṁ). Śrī is “the kingdom, the power and the glory” by which a Ruler rules. Virāj, then, as Śrī, is identified with Indrāṇi “the Person in the left eye,” Indra being the Person in the right eye (BU. IV. 2. 3);* their place of union is the heart (ib., and SB. X. 5. 2. 11), and it is there in the heart (whether in our own heart or at the heart and capital of the external kingdom) in “sleep,” i.e., the restraint of the sense powers, which are thus “possessed” (as a King possesses his Fortune) that one becomes as it were a Great King and mover-at-will in his own realm (BU. II. 1. 17, 18, cf. BG. V. 13).

In our context, to which the text of AV. VIII. 9. 10 “Who knoweth her progenitive-duality (mīthunatvām)’ is so pertinent, cf. AV. II. 36. 3 where the wife “should rule” (et rājātu) her house, the Virāj is evidently (like Śrī) rather feminine than masculine, and corresponds to the Virāj of AV. VIII. 9 and

*And CU. IV. 15 etc. That in SB. III. 1. 3. 11, 14 Śuṇḍa or Vṛtra are the Person in the eye is to be understood in connection with the fact that Indra is now what Vṛtra was (SB. I. 8. 3. 17). For the Person in the eye cf. also Plato, Alcibiades I. 133 and Philo, I. 15.
Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power

ŚB. IV. 6. 7. 9 vy évá dravata), (she) saying: "He hath come into being from me" (mad udhy abhāt), 27—whence the expression "Honey-son" (madhu-putra). In the preceding version of JUB. I. 50. 1, 2, the "Two Worlds" are explicitly Sky and Earth, and it is the Gods who call upon them to unite (samarṣam, cf. RV. X. 24. 5 ahrvane devāh pīnar ā vahatād īti), and the reluctance of the Sky is his "horror" of her (so śāv asya abidhatsata), and it is only after elaborate purifications that they unite (sametya, converse of viyantā, etc., elsewhere), and engender the Solar Chant.

That the marriage of the two Aghis, the former and the latter, "who hate one another," should be that of Mitra and Varuṇa is in perfect agreement with the common doctrine that Mitrāvāraṇau form a progenitive pair (mithunam), a syzygy of conjoint principles, in which Mitra is the male and Varuṇa the female partner, an "opposition" or "polarity" which is that of Day to Night, of Light to Darkness (TB. I. 7. 10. 1 maitrānah vā āhah vāruni rātriḥ, etc.). References to Mitrāvāraṇau as prāṇāpānau (or prāṇādānau) and as brahmāksatrau are too many for separate citation. More explicitly in PB. XXV. 10. 10 and ŚB. II. 4. 4. 19 "Mitra inseminates (rēlaḥ śīṃcāt) Varuṇa," and in ŚB. XII. 9. 1. 17 Varuṇa is the womb (yost), Indra the seed (retas), and Savitri the progenitor (rēlasah prajanayitṛ), an obvious allusion to the Varuṇasava and the birth of Indra; Varuṇa, in other words, being Savitri, and as such the mother of the solar Indra. In Mbh. XII. 319. 39 Mitra is

10 where she is at once "This" (Earth, World) and that Nature (nature nātarmah) from whom all things milk their specific qualities.

In TS. IV. 5. 4 Sky and Earth are respectively the svarāj and the virāj (cf. CU. VIII. 25. 2 svarāj and asvārāj), approximately Empire or Autocracy and "Vice-royalty" or "Kingship"; and it is, of course just in this sense that the supremacy of the brahma is related to that of the īṣṭu.

Our text may also contain an allusion to the Virāj which is the Nourishment (asa) produced by the Sacrifice (JU B. I. 233, 234, cf. H. 82); and the probability of this is increased by the fact that JU B. I. 233 speaks of an excess of the Yajña over the Virāj as a fault, the phrase virāḥ nātṛṣaṣṭaṇas suggesting the ēsa sambhavane Sriyag posts B. I. 84. 7 where it is evident that it is only when this unconformity has been corrected that "they became the Virāj."

27 I. e. "He has been born as my son"; whereas in BU. I. 4. 4 "He has be
gotten of himself," i.e. "I am his daughter," cf. note 24. Both are correct propositions, and both serve as the ground for the mother's withdrawal. The rebirth of the father as the son is in accordance with the Indian and universal doctrine of progenitive reincarnation and consequent contemporaneity of father and son; the wife who bears a son becoming thereby the husband's "second mother" (janaś tiṣaṇ, AR. VII. 13, cf. Mbh. I. 68. 47 [Poona ed.]).
purusa and Varuna prakriti. The same relations subsist when the names of Mitranvarunau are replaced by the terms apara and para brahma (mahabrahma, brahma-yoni) as in BG.VII, 5-6 and XIV, 3-4 where Krshna sets the embryo (garbhah) in the Great Brahman, his own Higher Nature (prakritis param, i.e. "Natura Naturans, Creatrix Universalis, Deus"), the womb (yoni) of all and whence is the becoming of all things, saying also that "I am the father that bestows the seed" (bijapradah pita). It is accordingly quite in order that so many of the terms expressing the relations of Mitravarunau, should have a sexual connotation. Abugnant, for example, like Latin cognoscere and Greek γνωσασθαι, Sanskrit jnā and English "know" ("Jacob knew his wife"), has an erotic value that is even more evident in SB.IV.6.7.10 where what is uttered by Vāc is literally a "conception" fathered by Manas (manasā abhipatam). The invitation uta māvatasa sāṁśrijāvahai (SB. cited above) corresponds to the marital mām anvivataḥ bhūtāḥ... sambhavatāh of JUB.I, 54.6 and the marriage formula of AV.XIV. 2.71, "I am He, thou art She; I am the Harmony, thou the Words; I am Sky, thou art Earth. Let us twain here become one; let us bring forth offspring" (āmo 'hām asmi, sā tvāṁ, sāmā 'hām asmy' āk tvāṁ, dyuṛ akhāṁ, prthiviḥ tvāṁ; tā hā sām bhūvāṁ, prajām ā janayāvahai), echoed in that for the marriage of Sacerdotium and Regnum in AB. VIII. 27, discussed below. In the same way in SB. X. 4. 1. 8, in connection with the union of Sacerdotium and Regnum, here represented by Indraṇi, ēkaṁ rāpām abhavaṭām... prājanayataḥ corresponds to tāu virād bhūtāḥ prajānaṇayātām with reference to the union of the Two Worlds.

Amongst the syzygies to which we have referred it is that of the Two Worlds, Sky and Earth (dyuṛprthivi, Zeus and Gaia), the universal parents upon whose harmony depend the prosperity and fertility of the entire universe, which is chiefly taken to be the norm and archetype of all marriage. Thus the samiti or sāṁśṛṣṭi of brahma and keśara is, in

29 We have already (note 4) called attention to the assimilation of Mitra to Manas and of Varuna to Urvasī in RV.VII.33.11 where the designation of Vasistha as "the son of Mitra and Varuna" (maitrāvarunau) can only mean that a mithunam of Mitra and Varuna has taken place, as in PB.XXX.10, 10, or in other words that Urvasī, thus manasā abhipatā, is Vāc. In PB.VII.8.1 it is equally clear that the birth of Vāma "amongst the Gods," i.e. the birth of Vāmadeva (the R̄ṣi of RV.IV.1-40), implies that a conjugation of Mitravarunau has taken place, which indeed explains the special connection of the Vāmadeva Sāman (Brhad Uktah) with sexual intercourse (vāmadevaṁ mithune proṣām, CU. II.13.2); cf. BU.IV.1.6 where Brahma as Manas betakes himself to "the woman," i.e. Vāc, and a son like himself is born of her, as also in PB. VII.6 where the father is Prajāpati; all these are versions of one and the same Ur-mythos.
the sense in which the Brāhmaṇas demand in every ritual operation, a conjunction (mithunām) of contrasted forms, apart from which contrast there would be no effective and productive coupling. The spark of life is only evoked, the sacrificial fire is only kindled, the music only illuminated when contact has been established between two oppositely charged poles, the two ends of the “Pole” that connects the Altar with the Sun, a pole that is “fired” from above and “lit” from below.

The relative femininity of Varuṇa will be all the more apparent if, in accordance with “the generally received opinion” (Macdonell) that Mitra is the Sun and Varuṇa the (dark) Sky, the solar “domain,” we consider the relation of the Sun (Āditya) to the Sky (Dyaus) for there are many texts that refer to the Sun as the husband of the Sky, pātīr divāḥ, as in AV.VII.21.1 and XIII.3.41.3, and CU.I.6.3 where “He” (ana) is the Sun and “She” (ad) the Sky. That “The Sun inseminates the Sky” (relah kramoti... ādityo divi, JB.II.241), that He “forms his likeness in the womb of the Sky” (saṅgīto rūpāṁ kramate dyōr upāśthe, RV.I.11.5), are no more than paraphrased in the words “Mitra inseminates Varuṇa,” cited above from PB. and SB. It is as the Sun that Prjaḥṣati unites with the Sky (ādityena divam mithunām sāmadhānau, SB.VI.1.2.4). Dyaus is conspicuously feminine in JUB.III.4.5f. where “The Great with the Great, the God with the Goddess, Brahma with the Brāhmaṇi united” (māhān māhyā samadhatta, devo devyā samadhatta, brahma brāhmanyā samadhatta), the text (as in ŚA.I.6) going on to explain that the reference is to the union of Agni, Vāyu, and Āditya with Earth (āgam eva maḥi, Air (antarikṣa) and Sky (dyau; brāhmaṇi implying, of course, “daughter of Brahma”), and that Agni, Vāyu and Āditya are the “Threefold Brahma” (verse 11, tad brahma vai triśūl, cf. MU.IV.6). To this “Threefold Sovereign” correspond the “Threefold” (trīśūl) World of RV.X.114.1, the “Three Bright” Realms (atraḥ... tirṣāḥ) that Bhṛṣpati reveals in RV.X.67.4 = uṣās tirṣāḥ in VIII.41.3, and the “One-syllabled” Voice

**As implied by the Annakramaṇi to AV.VII.21, mantrakṛtānādevatāyam, the Sun is here the Universal Spirit (āśājagatah tathāgataḥ ca) of RV.I.113.1, the Hirdraman of RV.VII.90.2 (sārgoy... śivāsyā atātīr jāgatah ca gopā, cf. note 34), the Universal Lord and Husband (śāmaḥ jāgatah tathāgataḥ pātim, Skyana sarmanam) of RV.I.89.3, the “multiple one” (viśvam śakam) who “plays the man” (palyate, Śayana abhigocchatī, cf. Mitra, brahma, as abhiṇaśī in SB.IV.1.4.1) to all that is in motion or at rest (śād dharmān, RV.III.54.8), and Parjanya of RV.VII.101.6: in other words, the divine Eros, Gānadhra, Brahma to whom the whole creation is feminine, for “All of us are the wives of one Lord, it is for Him that we shall adorn ourselves” (kaṁ sab naṁ eka śatōre, sab kośī teha karośi śāyāna, Kahir); just as considered individually the body is “the sensitive image, daughter and bride” of the soul (V. da S. Pinto, Peter Sterry, Puritan and Platonist, pp. 166-167).
whose three parts, distinguished by Prajāpati, are these worlds, as explained in PB. XX. 14, 2-5.

Dyau is feminine in some twenty Vedic contexts: the apposition **dyauv aditiḥ** (Grassmann, "der Himmel bildlich als Mutter") may be noted in X.63.3, where Aditi is the "Vāc, Aditi by name, in whom may Savitri quicken the Law (dharma svarṣati) for us" of TS. I.7.7.1. This implied equation of Dyau with Savitri (the form again implying "daughter of," cf. the relation of Varuṇa to Savitri in SB. XII. 9.1.17 cited above) is explicit in JUB. IV.27.11, 12 "The Sun is Savitṛ, the Sky his daughter . . . this is one coupling" (āditya eva savitā, dyauv savitri . . . tad skam māhunam), as likewise in SA. I.5. Savitri, "daughter of Savitṛ," is the same as the Śuryā Savitri, the Daughter of the Sun, given to Soma the King in AB. IV. 7, and the Śuryā of RV. X. 85. 9, who is there and in AV. XIV.2 the type of all brides. In AB. III. 48 Śurya is Dhātṛ (m.) and Dyau Anumati (Gāyatrī, f.). Savitri is, again, Prajāpati (bhuvaṇasya prajāpatiḥ, RV. IV. 53.2, etc.), the universal Progenitor, and it is as such that he unites with his own daughter "whom some call Sky and others Dawn" (dīvam vasūgam vā, SB. I.7.4.1; AB. III. 33): ** while as Mānas (TS. VI. 6.10.1, etc.) he unites

**The Two Worlds (imau lokau, dyauvdyāśātviva, roṣaṛi, kāśām, etc.), celestial and terrestrial, essential and natural, were originally one, as is often explicit and still more often implied by their "separation." This separation from one another, which is in order that there may be "room" for a procedure from potentiality to act (TS. V.1.5.8, SB. I.4.1.22-23) is variously brought about: but that the worlds are separated by the birth of the Sun, by Agni, Indrāgni, Light or Lightning, the Axis Mundi (akambha) or the Bridge (ṣetu), "by Varuṇa's operation" or "at the flat of the Imperishable" (akṣara), or at Dawn, are only different ways of saying the same thing.

Their fear or shyness of one another is generally connected with the incest motif, presupposed by the fact of their common origin, which makes them father and daughter and brother and sister, like Zeus and Hera: where there is "nonduality" (adeśita), it is only with his own nature that the Deity can be united, and this could be avoided only at the price of dualism. It is, indeed, inasmuch as essence and nature are one is divisic that the act of creation has sometimes been thought of as auto-erotic.

We cannot deal at length with the incest motif here (cf. note 27), except to remark that the Theotokos is necessarily feminine to God in every possible relation, as daughter, sister, mother and bride; and to note the Christian doctrine as resumed in Dante's "O Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son" (Paradiso XXXIII.1) and "Bride of the Emperor of Heaven; and not bride alone but sister and most beloved daughter . . . existing in him in true and perfect fashion as if eternally wedded to him" (Convite, III. 12); that is to say, in the same way that Prajāpati, the Progenitor, "had Vāc alone as his own," whom he only separated from himself as a mother of whom to be born (PB. VII. 8; XX. 14).

In ancient Roman Law the wife was said to stand to the husband in sīlīā loco.
with Vāc (passim), who is again the daughter (VS. XV. 38, SB. VIII. 1.2.8) as well as the mother of whom he is born (PB. VII.6). The Sun is thus beyond any question male to the Sky: Bergaigne's "Avant tout les autres éléments mâles il faut placer le ciel lui-même" is only true with the reservation "Le mâle du ciel est le soleil" (La religion védique, I.4 and 6).

The relationship of Sun to Sky discussed above is the same as that of Vāyu to Air and Agni to Earth (which last is also that of Yama to Yami, SB. VII. 2.1.10); the ratio is by no means peculiar to the "upper world," but to all "Three Worlds," and to all the pairs in any of these worlds; the relationship is "universal." As was also implied in JUB. III.4.5 f., cited above, the Three Gandharvas or Lights, Agni, Vāyu, Āditya (the "Persons" of the Vedic "Trinity," and the "Universal Lights" of the Fire-altar) form with their respective domains, "lots" or "participations" (bhakti), Earth, Air and Sky, three forms of Dawn (usas), three progensitive pairs or syzygies (mithunāṇi, PB. XX. 15.2-4). The text of RV. VII. 33.7 (followed in PB. ib. and JB. II. 241) is even

\[\text{Vāc (Latin vox) as Theotokos is not the Logos (Lat. verbum), but the means or organ by which the Logos (byōd uktaka) is uttered.}\]

The solar Prajāpati's own child-bearing precedes and must not be confused with the giving birth to the child by his consort. The normal doctrine about generation applies as divins as much as in the world: it is that the father of all "bears himself in himself" (ātmasy evātmānam bhāvati), and "when he pours it into the woman as seed (tad yadā striyāṃ śītaceti) then he propagates it." (athaṁj jayati) and her giving birth to it follows (AA. II.5). In PB. VII.6, accordingly, Prajāpati sees that the embryo is within him (gārhyo ... anviśātā, cf. RV. III. 57.3 gārboh usmin, with reference to Agni as embryo) and then separates Vāc from himself as a mother of whom to be born; just as also in SB. VI. 1.2.2.6-11 he is specifically "pregnant" (gārbyo anātā dēit ... garbhā bāhēcat) and then uniting with Vāc "expresses," etjati) those beings that he has conceived and of which she is to be the mother.

The same principles apply to the "second birth" in upasāyana, where the spiritual father makes the disciple "an embryo within him (gārboh antā) and bears him in his belly (udāre bhāvati) for three nights," after which he is born of Sāvitrī as his mother (AV. XI. 5.3, Manu II. 38, 170), cf. Hermes Trismegistus, Lib. XIII.2.

That both parents are thus thought of as child-bearing, i.e. "carrying," so that we can speak of them as "two wombs, one union" (te dev yonī, ekam mithuṇam, no more contradicts their sexual and functional differentiation (one only gives birth) than does the designation of the universal parents as pitarā or mātā in RV. passim imply that both are male or both female (their Supreme Identity, tad ekam, is of course androgynous), or than does the couvade (of which the father's child-bearing, as explained above is certainly the mythical basis) imply any distinctive femininity on the father's part, but rather that like the brahma, that is both the brahma and the kṣatra, he is thought to still as a first principle in which both natures are combined.
more explicit: "Three foremost Lights, three Aryan children, inseminate the worlds (kṛtvānti bhūvanesi rētas), three Heats (gharmacah = ghrāmd, du. + Mātarīśvan in RV.X.114.1 = trīṇ ghrāman in AV. IX.1.8) enshroud the Dawn (usāsān sacante); these the Vasiṣṭhas know full well"; cf. RV. III. 56. 3 "The mighty three-faced (tryantkāh) Bull is the husband (patyate), he the inseminator of the Everlasting Dawns" (retodhā ... sāsvatīnām), the "Three Greats" (tisrō mahīḥ) of the preceding verse (— Ilā, Sarasvatī, and Mahī, III. 5. 8); RV. VII. 101. 6 "He (Parjanya), the Bull, the inseminator of the Everlasting-Dawns (sā retodhā vṛzahāḥ sāsvatīnām), in whom is the Spirit of all that is in motion or at rest" (tāsmān ātmā jāgatas tāsthāṣā ca); and RV. I. 115. 1 where "Earth, Air and Sky" (ādyātēṛprthivā antārikṣam) are filled by the Solar Spirit of all that moves or is at rest" (sāryāt ātmā jāgatas tāsthās ca). The King of Kings is thus the progenitive Solar Spirit, who takes the forms of Agni, Vāyu and Āditya in relation to the triple Dominion or Three Dominions which are so often spoken of as Dawn or Dawns, and are the Three Worlds of Earth, Air and Sky, the "Three Earths" (prīthivīs tisrāh) of which Savitṛ is the Mover (invali) in RV. IV. 53. 5, Savitṛ's "Three bright realms" (trīr ... rocanaṇi) that his, the Asura's (asya ... āsurasya, cf. RV. III. 53. 1), three Hero-sons (trāyo ... vīrāh — VII. 33. 7, prajā aryāḥ — I. 105. 5 anīt ye devāḥ) govern in RV. III. 56. 7, 8.**

**sāsvatāḥ in Grassmann's sense 2. The designation of the Domains (Three Worlds) as "Everlasting Dawns" (sāsvatīḥ) corresponds to that of the "Three Realms of Light" as "indestructible" (dāñcāsa) in RV.III. 56. 8.

**In full agreement with the Sāṃhitā texts cited above, BD. I. 71-73 explains that the "Three World-Overlords" (lokadhīpatayaḥ) are not a plurality of principles but are distinguished only by their functions; there are not three distinct deities, but only "severally named in accordance with their spheres": "they arise from one another (anyonyayonitāḥ), all their 'participation' is in the Spirit." (teṣām ātmātva tat sarvam yad yad bhaktiḥ). This last is clearly an allusion to PB. XX. 15. 2, where the "participations" or "shares" of the Three Gandharvas are the Three Realms. It is with reference to these "shares" that we find in JUB. I. 7. 2 manasaḥ nāma (pāpānam bhūtrayam) nirbhajet.

For SB.VII. 2. 1-4 Agni, Vāyu, and Āditya are the forms that Prajāpati assumes in relation to Earth, Air, and Sky. AB.V. 25 calls them the "house-fathers" (ghrapatayaḥ) of the Three Worlds; CU.I. 6. 1-3 states the same relationships in terms of Sāman and Re; the former as Agni, Vāyu, Āditya resting upon Earth, Air and Sky in the same sense that in AB.III. 23 the one Sāman unites with the triple Re. MU.IV. 6, the locus classicus in the Upaniṣads for the cia āffirmativa and via remotionis, expands the brahma vai triṣṭ of JUB. III. 4. 11 and calls Agni, Vāyu, and Āditya (identified with Brahmā, Rudra, and Viṣṇu) "the foremost forms of the immortal, incorporeal Brahma"; to whichever one of these a man is attached, his fruition is of a corresponding
The knowledge of the Three Worlds and their Rulers is the “Triple Science” (trāyānviṣayā) of JUB. II. 9. 7. Of the logoi (vyāhṛtayāh, JUB.
world (cf. BG. VII. 23), but though one should contemplate and praise these forms of Brahma, thereby rising higher and higher in the worlds (cf. SB. VIII. 7. 1. 23 where the Universal Lights are stepping stones or rungs of the ladder—āṣam-
vidyā—whereby to ascend or descend in these worlds), one should finally deny them, in order to attain to the unity of the Person (purāṇa).
The citations from the Sāṅkhāyāna amply suffice to show that these interpretations of the Vedic Trinity as a Triune Person are not the expressions of any “later” monotheistic tendency, but simple restatements of Vedic doctrine. They are, furthermore, in whole agreement with RV, V. 44. 6 “It is just in accordance with his aspect that he is given names” (yādāḥ svā adhāre tādāḥ ucyate), cf. SB. X. 5. 2. 20 “As he is approached, even such he becomes” (yathā-yathopāsate tād svā bhavrati).
It is evident that the “Three Gandharvas” are the “Three-headed Gandharva,” the “Three-headed Sun,” and that if three “Universal Lights” can be distinguished by the theologian, “there corresponds to all of them one single reality” (St. Thomas Aquinas, Sum. Theol., I, 13. 4. ad 2), that of the unity of the Person, Brahma, Savitṛ, Prajāpati, Spirit, and Light of lights (ātman, jñotisām jñotis, jñotir uttamam, etc.); the Father, Mover, Pastor, and Emperor of all that is in motion or at rest. The customary distinction of “Hinduism” from “Brahmanism” is essentially fallacious; it rests on nothing more than the modern historian’s sense of an obligation to demonstrate an “evolution” of thought.
The Hindu Trinity of Powers consists of a solar Father above, a fiery Son on earth (whence he ascends to heaven), and the Gale of their common spiration, and is thus indistinguishable from the Christian Trinity (it also corresponds to Plato’s threefold constitution of the whole soul). It is even more exactly and in detail the equivalent of the Gnostic doctrine of the Three Christos or Triple-Power: “Viewing the cosmos as a tripartite unit (=trīyāyam, RV. X. 114. 1) . . . they taught that the Saviour was manifested in the three divisions in a form and manner suited to the mode of being and needs of each. . . . In his capacity as parāvierśi (= one in nature) he is related to the cosmos as a whole, while the designation Triple-Power signifies his association with the universe as triply divided” (Baynes, Bruce Codex, pp. 64, 77). Cf. BD. I. 99, 100 and BU. I. 2. 3 on the three forms of Agni.
The Indologist’s conviction of an Indian polytheism and pantheism is a residue of Christian prejudice surviving even in the rationalist. In a parallel connection Goodenough remarks: “Philo himself was fully aware of the universal tendency in paganism toward the doctrine of a single supreme deity. In one place he says: ‘But if he exists whom with one accord all Greeks and barbarians acknowledge together, the supreme Father of gods and men and the Maker of the whole universe, whose nature is invisible and hard to grasp not only by the eye but even by the mind’, . . . Coulson in his note on this passage cannot believe his eyes that Philo thus ascribes monotheism to all pagans. So far as I can see Philo was telling the simple truth as he saw it, not as Christian propaganda has ever since misrepresented it.” (An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, p. 105).
It was not, however, at any rate not in India, that “the approach to this monotheism had been by the reduction of individual deities to aspects of the
single divine power," as Goodenough assumes: on the contrary, it was precisely the universality of the supreme deity that made it possible for local deities to be accepted as forms of That One (tev ekam) who is of many aspects (purusa) and polynomial (bhurini tava ... nima, RV. III. 20. 3). It is only by a wilful disregard of Vedic dietic, an inadequate correlation of texts, and it must be added, a general ignorance of theology and of metaphysics, that any sort of plausibility can be given to the notion of a Vedic polytheism. El πάλαι γελοετος (Hermes Trismegistus, Lib. XI. 1. 11)

Cl. Plotinus, Enneda, IV. 4. 8; Dionysius, De divinis nominibus; St. Thomas Aquinas, Sum Theol., I. 13. 4 and especially I. 31. 2. "We do not say the only God, for deity is common to several"; also my "Vedic Monotheism" in the Journal of Indian History, XV. 1936.

**In the Buddhist story of the Bodhisatta Jotipāla ("Protector of the Light," D. II. 220 f.) the Purohitaship to which he succeeds is referred to as the govidiya (not in the PTS Dictionary), and the Purohit is the Mahā-Govinda. This epithet does not mean "high treasurer" as rendered by Malalasekara, for it was not the Purohit's function to act as treasurer: nor does it mean "High Steward" in the special and literal sense of "Lord of the Herds," as is suggested in Dialogues 2. 226. It much rather means "Shepherd of the Flock" or "Pastor" in that sense in which the Sun, Agni, or Brahaspati is the "Herdsman of the World" (jagata or bhavanasaṃ gopā), and in that of John X. 14 "I am the good shepherd and know my sheep." The pastorate of a kingdom reflects the herding of the "unfaltering Herdsman" (gopā, RV. I. 164. 31, cf. JUB. III. 37. 1 and III. 29. 6), that of "the Herdsman of the world, the Knower, whose kine are never lost" (vedāṇa evāvajātur bhavanasaṃ gopā, RV. X. 17. 3, where vedāṇa gopā is just what govit, goerisdu, and govidua mean). That "he is a herdsman's tongue" (govatātātra, RV. III. 38. 9) is as much as to say that the flock knows his voice and follows him (as in John X. 4 and 27).

We digress to remark that the notion of a divine shepherd may well be of high antiquity, going back to the earliest pastoral times. The notion of a divine pastor and of an analogous human pastorate is one of the very many formulas common to Platonic and Vedic philosophy, nor is there anything in either of
these forms of the Philosophia Perennis that can be called unique. There is an art of herding human beings, royal and statesmanlike (State and, 267 C); at the beginning of a new "period" (= Skr. kalya or mañucatura), and during the rule of Kronos (the father and predecessor of Zeus), "God himself was the herdsman of men, watching over them" (ib. 271 E); "the type of the divine shepherd ( tense pousg) is greater than that of the king" (ib. 275 E, cf. Republic 440D where the brave and eager principle, the lover of victory—i.e., the Kyatriya and Jisya part of the soul—is the ruling shepherd's "dog"). The royal art is one of "judgment and watching over" (State and 292 B). In all these statements, of course, we must not be misled by the word "royal," because Plato's conception of government is essentially theocratic (Laws 713E, cf. Republic 431B, Meno 99F), and by "king" he means priest- or philosopher-king, or in any case a government by both in complete agreement (Republic, 473 f., cf. State and 290E). In Christianity the Good Shepherd is "both king and priest." The government and care of men is preeminently the sacred function, but in so far as the royal function is delegated to a king the latter can also be called a shepherd of men, as in some of the Indian texts where the king too is a gopa. We need hardly add that Kṛṣṇa's epithet Govinda, and that he is the "Divine Cowherd," do not mean that he was in any historical sense a herdsman by caste but that he is a solar hero, and like the Bodhisattva a "descent of the Sun."

To return to India, Bṛhaspati is "our far-seeing Herdsman and pathfinder" (no gopa pathikā viṣṇu jayā, RV II. 23. 6), Agni "Lord authentic (rāja... tmān) of Sky and Earth and as it were their Herdsman" (pasupā te, RV I. 144. 6), "Thou who at birth didst look about upon the worlds, even as a lively herdsman that goeth round about his king" (RV VII. 13. 3). The human Purohita is, as we know, the embodiment and representative of this Agni-Bṛhaspati, and naturally exercises similar functions; he is the Pastor of the Flock, or "Shepherd of the Realm" (raṣṭragopa); the marriage of the King to the Priest is the "restoration (purnādāya) of the Brāhmaṅ's wife," and it is when this restitution has been made that "then the Kṣatriya's realm is warded" (raṣṭrāṇa gupitām kṣatrīpya, RV X. 109. 3).

A brief expansion of the last remark may be useful. Sāyaṇa's explanation of RV X. 109 (Griffith's "unintelligible fragment, and of comparatively late origin") is excellent. The Brāhmaṅ's (Vācaspāti's) wife is Vāc. Misled (de-diced from her proper allegiance) by one "who can approach her only in sin" (RV, X. 71. 9) the royal Voice is no longer an expression of the Truth, but on the contrary subverts the whole cosmic order. This evil is corrected when "Agni as Hira takes her hand and leads her" (hastaṣṭhā māmām, i.e. marries her,—in the person of the King). It is precisely this reducio regni ad sacriizium that is effected in the Rājasūya, in the ritual marriage of the King and the Purohita; and it is only when this marriage has been accomplished that "the realm is guarded" (raṣṭrāṇa gupitām), i.e. by the Brāhmaṅ as raṣṭragopa, as a wife is guarded by her husband. The reference to the "lidle" in X. 109. 5 is to the

* "Thy kingdom come" (Mat. VI. 9): "where the Priesthood and the Kingship move together in one accord (yatva brahma ca kṣatriya ca māyāsāṣa ca varatah saha), that holy world I vain would know." (VS XX. 5).
performance of the Sacrifice in which King Soma is now cooperative (sacrata) with Agni; the King whose open hand is as it were a sacrificial ladle (see note 30) is no longer one of "those who do not offer the libation" (nā satkharṣaḥ, RV. X. 71.9).

The marital values of sat and āspa (to lead," and to "lead up," "reduce," or "induct") will not be overlooked: the husband is in relation to the wife the "Duke" (nāyaśa), she is the "Duchess" (nāyaṣki). The upanyāsa of a disciple by a master is that an asudgrahana or "lifting up" and "exaltation," and we have no doubt that the traditional marriage is really an initiation of the woman, comparable to that of a brāhmaścārin by the ṛcērya, or, that both "inductions," are "mysteries"; cf. ṛmēṣa etc., in the related senses to "perfect," "initiate," "be married," "died." Cf. note 25. It may well be asked whether sati, "leading" and rājanitī, "King's leading" as designations of the "Art of Government" do not contain an explicit reference to the disciplinary and marital relation of the King to the Purohitas, his Guru. In our hymn, RV. X. 109.4b and 5a the reunion of the kṣatra and brahma is expressly assimilated to the upanyāsa of a brahmaścārin by an ṛcērya, and this is in agreement with the disciple to master relationship of the King to the Priest explicit in the Arthaśāstra (see note 17). We know already that the King's marriage to the Brāhman is part of a sacrificial rite and involves an initiation (dikṣā).

Now the induction of the disciple by the master is also an af-filiation by which the former is made directly a foster-son of the master and his wife and by analogy a foster-son of God and his consort. "The mother is Sāvitrī, the ścērya the father" (Manu, II. 170, 171, cf. AV. XI. 16. 3). The parallel may be noted in Hermes Trismegistus, Lib. XIII where "the mother is Sophia... the will of God the inseminator... some man who is a son of God the mediator in this palingenesis." The master (ścērya) is a Brāhman, that is to say a "son of Brahman, "son of God" (as the patronymic brāhmaṇa states) and represents Sāvitrī, the brahma; in the same way the master's wife is the representative of Sāvitrī, Vāc, as brāhmaṇā, "the Brāhman's wife" in our hymn. The pupil becomes a member of their household, in which he is fostered. In this connection it may be observed that there can be little doubt that the ancient European custom of "fostering" (of which our "boarding schools" are a late secular survival or superstition) originally involved an initiation. If marriage is also an af-filiation we can see why it is that the wife has been traditionally said to stand to her husband, who is also her Guru, as loco fīliās, originally a metaphysical and afterwards a legal formula; the fact of marriage making her a "daughter." These conditions are still reflected in the fact that a Priest addresses the members of his flock as "My son" or "My daughter," and is himself addressed as "Father," and why a nun is addressed as "Mother," or "Sister." And if the King's "marriage" to the Brāhman is strictly analogous to the induction of a disciple by a master, we can as easily see that his seduction of "the Brāhman's wife" (Vāc, Sāvitrī, Sophia) in RV. X. 109 is analogous to that of a master's wife by a disciple, for which such dire penance is imposed (Manu IX. 237, 238, XI. 104-107).

The word goviṇḍa is not (as inferred by the PTS. Dictionary and in the Dialogues) the equivalent of a Sanskrit govendra but, in accordance with Pāṇini

* All reductions of effects to causes are marital reunions.
knowledge “dies no more” (na punar marīyat) but lives out his life to old age (AB. VIII. 25).  

(III.1.138, Vārtt. 2), of goēt, “one who knows, or finds kine” and to be correlated with goaey, to “wish, or seek for kine”; the word division is go-vinda, analogous to go-pā, go-paṭi and paśu-pā. Moreover, go and paśu, while literally “herd,” “cattle,” “flock,” do not by any means always mean “animals” other than men, but often refer to “man” himself, the animal man, and are thus used as the equivalent of praṣā, “children (of men),” as in AV, XIV. 2. 25 where the children of the bride are referred to as paśavā, in AA. II. 3. 2 where paśavā denotes both animals in general and the animal man as distinguished from a “person,” and in BU. I. 4. 10 where the man who has not realised “I am Brahma,” and therefore approaches some God as “another than himself,” is called a paśu, an “animal” fitted only to be regarded as food for the Gods.

**“Dies no more” corresponds to the “O king, live for ever” of several Old Testament contexts; cf. note 22. The present is one of the many passages (e.g. 6B. II. 3. 3. 9) in which the connection of punaṃstva, “recurrent death,” is not with a future but with this present life. The particular context is paralleled by that of 6B. V. 4. 1. 1 where “He who performs the Rājasya escapes all death (sārūṇ . . . mṛtyuṁ ātimucyate), all assaults (sārūṇ bodhān), only old age is his death” (tāya jñate mṛtyur bhavati); cf. note 22. The deaths referred to are the same as the sārī mṛtyur (Caland, "Todesarten, Lebensgefahren," cf. Hied, XII. 322, "the myriads of fates of death that beset us") of JB. II. 4. 419, where they are to be avoided by “not deviating from the divine marriage, the sacrifice, etc.” (dācyat āsa viśāhān āta . . . yujāt āsa āta). Thus one who is forearmed by initiation and sacrifice may be called “undying” (amṛta). “even though he has no hope of never dying at all” (6B. II. 2. 2. 14), a hope that he could not have, because “no one becomes immortal in the flesh” (6B. X. 4. 3. 9).

Where we speak nowadays of “surviving a mortal danger” the traditional philosophy sees an actual death and rebirth; thus in TS. II. 3. 5. 3 it is with the words “His birth is renewed again and again” (nāvo-nāvo bhavati jaya-mānāḥ, RV. X. 30. 19, etc.) that the life (duṣa) of the sick man is restored. All life, as a “becoming” (bhava, gṛhena), involves the repeated death of what has been and birth of what is: reincarnation (in this legitimate sense of the word) belonging as much to this present life as to any other form of temporal existence. The application of the words “Sure is the death of what has been born, and sure the birth of what has died” (BG. II. 27, and the basis of Socrates’ argument for the survival of the soul, in Phaedo) is as much to daily living as to the special cases of rebirth from a mother, initiatory palingenesis, and “death when the time comes.” Living (ex-istence, esse) is a repeated resurrection; life eternal has neither rebirth nor recurrent death, because it is not a becoming, but an immutable being (essaentia).

In all this there is nothing peculiarly Indian. The “immortality,” or rather “not-dying,” envisaged by the Indian texts in which it means “living out the whole of one’s life” (amanustvatvām yat sāreṣṭam śānuḥ śrītī, ĀB. IX. 5. 1. 10), and which is to be distinguished from an “incorruptible immortality in the world of heavenly-light” (amanuvatvām aśaṁśa svarga loke, KB. XIII. 3 and XIV. 4)—the two are analogous, but not to be confused—is exactly the same as the
We have seen that the triple relation of the Lights to their Realms is really the single relationship of the Light to the Cosmos, and since the Lights and their Realms, of which Savitṛ is the Prime Mover, are spoken of as "Three Skies" (tisrō divāḥ) and "Three Earths" (prthivīs tisrāḥ, RV. IV. 53. 5), it is clear that the relationship of the Sacerdotium to the Regnum, or that of Man to Woman, or that of any Director to any Executive, can be more briefly expressed as that of Sky to Earth. Thus from one point of view the Sky is feminine to the Sun, but from another the Sky is no less male to the Earth (Zeus to Gain, Europa, Danæ, etc.) and literally "Lord and Master" of Earth,—Adhipati, Bhūpati, Kṣetrapati and Vāstospati. Thus, RV. V. 63. 3 (divāspāti prthivyā nitrāvāraṇaḥ, "Ye, Mitrāvaruṇaḥ, are (respectively) Lords-and-husbands of Sky and Earth") is as much as to say, "Thou, Mitra, art Lord of Dyaus (—Varuṇa), and thou, Varuṇa (—Dyaus), art Lord of Earth." It is in just the same way that while "the Regnum is dependent upon (anunīyuktaṃ) the Sacerdotium, the Commons are dependent on the Regnum" (AB. II. 33); and that while the Sacerdotium is virile to the King and Commons (PB. II. 8. 2), the King, whose vīra is analo-

"immortality" (not-dying) described to Socrates in the Symposium 207 D-208 B: "The mortal nature ever seeks, as best it can, to be immortal. In one way only can it succeed, and that is by becoming or generation (vēsava); * since so it can always leave over a new creature in place of the old.... Every mortal thing is preserved in this way; not by keeping it exactly the same for ever, like the divine, but by replacing what abscends or is inveterated with something else new in the semblance of the original. Through this device, Socrates, a mortal thing partakes of immortality, both in the body and in all other respects; by no other means can it be done." Similarly Plutarch, Moralia, 302 D. This also represents the Buddhist conception of living: a repeated dissolution as one thing followed by reappearance as another (tum vattīya divasassas ca suñced eva vajjati suñca mitra-jhāti, S. II. 98), thus overcoming recurrent death as in 8B. II. 3. 3. 9 cited above and in JB. I. 13 (cf. I. 5) punarjnatvā atmānaye yud ahorātre, "he escapes recurrent death in that he (sacrifices) night and morning." The idea of a "participation" in immortality occurs already in RV. I. 164. 21: it is the same as that of the participation of existence in being, and that of the participation of the beautiful in beauty.

Thus, that the King is made "undying" is not merely a rhetorical and flattering expression, but has a meaning; it does not mean that he will never die, but that he will not die prematurely.

**The Vāstospati, who is evatapd and associated with the brahma in RV. X. 61. 7, is evidently the Indra of RV. VIII. 97. 10; and the same as the kṣetrasa pati of RV. X. 69. 13, VII. 35. 19 and IV. 57. The Vāstospati of RV. VII. 54. 1 and 55. 1 may be Soma (though Sāyaṇas equates indra in VIII. 69. 1 with Indra), but even so still represents the kṣetra.

* This may be intended to cover both ordinary "becoming," and also "progenitive reincarnation": both involve a kind of "never dying."
gous to Indra's, and is only properly to be regarded as a Dominion (raṣṭrā) inssofar as he generates (prajāyaṇa, SB IX. 4.1.5; cf. I. V. 279 where because the King has no son the people complain that the Kingdom will utterly perish), is preeminently virile to the Realm; so that while the virility (virya) pertains more eminently to the brāhmaṇa, both brāhmaṇa and kṣatra are "virilities" (SB I. 3.5.4-5). In the same way, too, the delegation of the sceptre, the vajra, as the token of dominion (SB XIII. 4.4.1), by the Priest to the King, though it strengthens him with respect to his enemies, weakens him with respect to the Sacerdotium, just as when the King himself delegates authority to others they become his vassals (SB IV. 4.15). The people are subject to the King, but not so the Brāhmaṇas, "whose King is Soma" (SB V. 4.2.3); the people are "food" for the King, but the King is "food" for the Brāhmaṇa (Kauś. Up. II.9); while there is another for whom the Regnum and the Sacerdotium both are "food" (KU. II.25). There is one, Bhaga (= Aditya), "to whom even the King says: "Apportion me a portion" (AV. III. 16.2). The Regnum is not its own principle, but is controlled by another, the Eternal Law, the Truth (dharma, satyam), the "Kingship of the Kingship" (kṣatrasya kṣatrām, BU I.4.14). This, incidentally, provides the sanction for the well known Cambodian doctrine of the Dharmārāja, as the real and persistent Royalty, to be clearly distinguished from the King's own temporal personality; cf. "Le roi est mort, vive le roi." Even a righteous emperor is not without an overlord; and "Who is this King above the King? The Eternal Law" (ko pana ... rāṇo ... rājā? dhammo, A. I. 109), a Law that equally rules the Sage (anudhammacāri na hi yati saccaparakkhami muni, A. I.149). And as is the King to his vassals, so are these to their own followers, so is the patron to the artist and the man to the wife, each in turn a servant and a master in a feudal hierarchy stemming from the King of Kings. That the King is feminine to the Priest but male to his own Realm is thus nothing strange, but only a special case of Order. In any Hierarchy, the individual is necessarily related in one way to what is above him, and in another to his own domain.

Amongst the syzygies to which we have referred it is, then, that of Sky and Earth (dvārpārthist), the universal parents upon whose harmonious cooperation, the prosperity and the fertility of the Universe depend, that is chiefly taken to be the norm and archetype of all marriage, so that in the marriage rite the man addresses the woman with the words: "I am He, thou art She; I am the Harmony, thou the Words; I am Sky, thou art Earth." Let us twain here become one; let us bring forth

As was pointed out by Weber, Indische Studien V.216, the formula Ego sum Gaius, tu es Gaia was employed in ancient Roman usage. Cicero, Murena 12 fin.
offspring” (ámó hám asmi, sá tvám, sámá hám asmy, ét tvám, dyantar ahám; pthiir tvám; té dé vá sam bhaveva, praajam á janayāvahai, AV. XIV. 2. 71). In the same way in China, Sky and Earth represent respectively the male, light and active, and female, dark and passive principles, yang and yin, and it is from this existence of the macrocosmic male and female principles that the distinction of husband and wife is derived; from the marriage of Sky and Earth “transformation in all its various forms abundantly proceeds” (I Ching, Appendix, III. 43, 45, and VI. 31). In the same I Ching, Appendix I (as cited by Fung Yu-lan, History of Chinese Philosophy, I. p. 387) we find “Because of their union, Heaven (Sky) and Earth, though separate, have their common work, just as man and woman, though separate, have a common will,” corresponding very closely to RV. III. 54. 6 where Sky and Earth are náná, samánä na krätuṇā samvidänā.28

We are now at last in a better position to understand the mutual choice or wooing (varana) of one another by the High-Priest and the King, and to understand the marriage formula with which the alliance of their “houses” is effected in AB. VIII. 27. The Purohita has been chosen as Guardian, or rather Pastor, of the Realm (raśtragopa), and now addresses the King with the following mantram, wherewith he takes him to wife: “I am That (ama, 'He') thou art This (sa);” thou art This, I am mentions the custom. Valerius Maximus, De praenominiibus, has: Ferunt enim Gaiam Casseliam, Tarquini Prieti regis uxorum, optimam lanificam amisse ut iudicium institueret, ut novae nuptiae ante jauam interrogaret quaeam vocantur Gaias esse se dicerent. Cf. Plutarch, Quæstiones Romanæ, XXX, and the note in the edition by H. T. Rose, Oxford, 1924.

28 For references to all the parallel versions and variants see Whitney in HOS, XIV. 760-767.

29 “Thy will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven... Heaven and Earth shall be in those days as Husband and Wife, tho’ one Principle, Nature and Shape; yet two Sexes, one the Image of the other; and two Persons, each having the entire Principle, Nature, and Shape, Distinctly, and Complectly, in itself,” Peter Sterry, in V. de S. Pinto, Peter Sterry, Puritan and Platonist, 1934, p. 290.

44 As being masculine, we follow Keith in rendering ama and sa by “That” and “This” (which are often the terms in which Heaven and Earth are referred to). The marriage formula (see above, and note 38) elsewhere has sa, “She,” and it may be that, as Keith suggests, sa is an error for sá; we are inclined, however, to think that the masculine sa is the result of an attraction to the actual and obvious sex of the person addressed, for we must not overlook that the marriage formula here applied to the case of two persons both of whom are empirically male, and that the words are spoken here only “as if” by a man to a woman.

Sky (dyaus) and Harmony or Music (sáma) are always masculine to Earth (prthiït) and Words (r̄). In AB.IV. 6. 7. 11 for example, “There in the order that male, the Sáma, approaches that female, the R̄” (úd̄ ed etúd̄ ev̄ p̄ ed ōd̄a
That. I am Sky, thou art Earth. I am the Harmony (sāman), thou the

yodān pehān sādasy ādhyaniti, the reference being to the congress of Mamas (grammatically n., but explicitly male in SB. I. 4. 4. 3 and always male to Vāc, cf. BU. IV. 1. 6 where "the woman" is Vāc), and Vāc (always both grammatically and effectively t.): in SB. VIII. 1. 3. 3 the Sāman is the husband (patti) of the Rc, which is as much as to say that reçapati = vēçapati. In the sāṃya cāmanas, pṛṣe may take the place of manas, as in JB. III. 359, where pṛṣe (anī) and vēc (ṛta) are referred to as "Hé" and "She" (sa, sā) and are united (ekam oḥānam, are married); or it may with the Brahmas that Vāc is conscious (BU. II. 2. 3). It will be seen, accordingly, that grammatical gender is by no means always a final clue to the effective gender of the referents: sāman, manas, and brāhma are grammatically neuter, but as persons effectively masculine; while conversely in JUB. I. 63. 2 "She" has to be rendered by yudh (n.), sa (m.) and sa (t.) to agree with ant, apānaḥ, and vēc (sa ṛk must be an error for sa ṛk). Cf. also the discussion of gender by Keith, Attaraya Arhagāka, pp. 298-309, note 1.

Comparison may also be made with SB. IV. 3. 2. 3, 4 where the Cantor (udgātṛ) is male to the Reciter (kotṛ, in the restricted sense) and the recitative is their offspring, AB. II. 5 where the vocal priest is by implication feminine to the Maithravaruna (Vaiśātha, Brahmā), and AB. VI. 3 where naturally male persons (the Subrahmanya and Neṣṭi priests) are treated as ritually female in accordance with their symbolic functions, and the question is asked: "How is it that they consider him who is really male as if he were a female?" (kasād evaṃ pumānānañc smarati śrīma śrīçeṣānañc patu). The answer to this question in our context would be that it is by their respective functions that the "sex" of the Sacerdotium and the Regnum is determined.

Every student of Indian ritual will have remarked the constant attribution of opposite sex even to inanimate objects that are made use of; an effect can only be produced by the conjunction of two functionally contrasted causes, respectively formal and material, i.e. masculine and feminine. It is, in fact, so in all making by art, where the word "concept" (formulation, expression) still implies that a "conjugation" ("yoking," or marriage) of intellect (sāman) with its organ (vēc) has taken place. We too still speak, although quite "superstitiously" (a "superstition" is a "survival"), of a "wedding" of words to music. In Western coronation rites the Bishop places a ring on the King's marriage finger, an action that says as plainly as if in words, "With this ring I thee wed."

Close American Indian parallels can be cited. Thus, "in Navajo literature and art all things go in pairs, male and female sometimes, but often two of the same sex, one strong, the other weak... one of the Twins is a weak aid to the other... Moon is the weaker of the Sun-Moon pair." (Newcomb and Reichard, Sound-paintings of the Navajo Shooting Chant, 1937, p. 55) and with reference to the necessity of such pairings is the confirmed Navajo belief that neither sex is self-sufficient, but both are necessary to fulfillment of any sort. There are many cases where two beings of the same kind (i.e. same ostensible sex) are paired, yet they are both males and (i.e. or both) females. Holy Man

*It is for the same reasons that the initiations, rites, sacrifices, and arts that have to do with the communion of men with Gods are spoken of by Plato as śvetāns.
Words (ṛc). Let us twain here unite our houses (suvahāvahāī pū-

(Monster Slayer) and Holy Boy (Child of the Waters); Sun and Moon. Holy Woman and Holy Girl are pairs of this kind. These combinations seem to point to the emphasis that weaker, more gentle powers are as necessary to well-being as the stronger more forceful ones. This explanation is a religious one in the light of the Navajo effort to secure harmony. Blue and black are “males” or better “dominating” colors in the Shooting Chant, white and yellow are the “female” or “submissive” colors” (Reichard, Navajo Medicine Man, 1939, p. 78).

Here, and in the marriage formula of AV XIV. 2. 71, we render sāma “chant,” by “Harmony” (Attunement or Music), because “all chanting and singing is music” (AA II. 3. 6 sāmitha ya ku ca gāṇaḥ saḥ śvarāḥ, cf. CU I. 6. 8 śāya yā ca sāma ca gāṇaḥ). Svara “note,” “tone,” or “music” is often rendered by “accent,” but what is meant is really “tone” as in Chinese and early Greek, not “stress” as in English: stress is, in fact, not a poetical but a prosaic quality. The contrast of sāma and ṛc is that of a Harmony that transcends Speech, and a verbal articulation on which the Music is supported as if in a vehicle (veda as rathunāra, PB VII. 6.3. 4 and 7.13.14). The Music is sung on words (ṛc) sāma gīvate, 68 VIII. 1. 3. 3) and borne or supported (ahyu- ādham, CU I. 6.1-5, pratīgīhitam CU I. 8.7) on them as an earth; this relation of the Music to the Words being the same as that of the Sun to the Moon in AV XV. 15.4,5, where the former is pravāhaḥ and the latter ahyādākaḥ; in these words Vēṇū has its marital significance, and it may be noted that pravāha can be applied to a woman only when she is a virago, a relatively masculine type. Thus the Harmony wedded to the Words is incarnated as if by a mother (68 IV. 3.2.3), the Rec is Vāc, and “the Great Litany (Agni) is her supreme adaptation” (parama vikāraḥ, AA II. 3.6). It is in the same way that the King brings forth (emotes) what the Priest knows (cf. notes 14a, 15), and that the formation of a concept begotten by Manas or Brahma on Vāc is a vital operation (BU II. 2. 3, IV 1.6, and Kaus U 30).

On the other hand, the Words considered apart from and in opposition to the Music (svara) are the “evil” (pàśma) of the Chant, and whoever seeks to take refuge in such a toneless Rec (ṛc as vARDAYAM) is found out by Death” (JUB I. 16.10, I.18.8, CU I. 4.3). It is because the words (ṛc) are the physical and mortal “body” of the Music as distinguished from itself, and “the body is given over to Death to be his share, so that no one becomes immortal with the body,” that Prajapati tells the Gods to approach the world of heavenly light by means of the wordless Chant (sāma ‘apena) and so indeed they did, “shaking off these bodies, the verbal tracks (etānti ṛkpadāni sarīrāni dhāmacante) that lay strewn (along their path) up to the Sky” (JUB I.15.31 with 68 X. 4.3.9); this is the same as the “ascent on wings of sound” (svapakṣa, JUB III 13.10) or “wings of light” (jayamānakṣa, PB X. 4.5), or “metrical wings” (chāntaḥ- paksam, AV VIII 9.12). Thus the devayāna is thought of as the vis negatīva (for the “ways of excellence and remotion” see MU IV 6): “the angels have fewer ideas and use less means than men” (Eckhart); “Not what is uttered by Vāc, not what men worship here, but that by which Vāc is uttered, know only that as Brahma. . . it is the Unknown that should be remembered, methinks” (vimānasam eva te mana evaditum, JUB IV. 18.5 and 19.1).

But while that which can be tracked pertains to our mortality (padeva ka-nai
punarmritya svāvetā), and it is just because the Immortals have left their tracks behind them that these Gods, Agni, Vāyu, Aditya, Candrāmas are (like the Buddha) in themselves "trackless" (sa ko ne śāsām decaśānam podām asti, JUB. III. 35. 7; āpada, kena podasa anesathā? Dh. III. 179), yet can be followed by their traces (padāni, scriptural, liturgical, iconographic, and relicary). There could, indeed, be no other "ascent after Agni" (TS. V. 6. 8. 1) than by following up the road on which the tracks are strewn of those who have gone before, until these footprints end with the road itself, beyond which lies the Unknown sumam donum "from which words recoil" (Taitt. II. 1. 4). A via affirmativa must precede the via negativa: "meanings" and images must not be discarded until they are no longer meanings to but meanings of ourselves, no longer figures of others but our own, who can then no longer see them over against "ourselves." The reader must not confuse the meta-physics of scripture with the "anti-intellectualism" of the modern mob. That the music of the spheres is "pure" of any objective sense is by no means a justification of our current love of fine sounds, miscalled "love of art"; when we say: "Leave it to pure sound when the meaning's almost nothing," this has nothing to do with the unintelligibility of the solar songs, but only commends the sensitive and aesthetic art of the charmer of snakes.

It must not be gathered from what has been said above that the Chant is a Music incomplete for lack of words. On the contrary, just as Agni is both Mitra and Varuṇa (RV. VII. 12. 3), "the great Brahma, one akṣara, inexpressible ātman, is both the brahma and the kṣatra" (SB. X. 4. 1. 9 with 12. XIII), parśura (MU. VI. 23), niruktānimukta, abhādāśī, etc., and can therefore as brahma stand alone, which is no more possible for the kṣatra (SB. IV. 1. 4. 2-3) than for a woman (Manu V. 148, cf. IX. 2), and just as the Spirit (ātman) is in itself an androgynous syzygy (BU. I. 4. 3, cf. Plato, Symposium, 189 E) and only by a schism of its two selves becomes a husband and wife, or brahma and kṣatra, so the quiddity of the Chant or Harmony (śaṃsaḥ śamāśca) is explained as the biunity of its logically differentiated elements, tone (śvara) and words (vyāh); the congress (samiti, saṁśāh, mithuna, etc.) of the masculine and feminine principles, like that of their verbal symbols (sa + ana = saana), making up the inseparable whole of the Harmony itself (a whole that had never been diminished by the differentiation of the words); it is only the mere words in themselves, and not the words as the support (pratītya) of the Harmony, that are "evil"; and in the same way for the relationship of the Sacerdotium and Regnum, or Inner and Outer Man.

It has, of course, been generally overlooked that in KU. II. 23 where there is a "choice" of one self by the other, in BU. IV. 4. 23 where "the pacified and dumpted (ānto dantāh) and composed (samāhitāḥ, "in samādhi") self sees itself only in the Self" (śūnti eva dānam pakṣayāt, i.e. being in the spirit sees only the Spirit, sees itself not as it is in itself but as it is in God); in BU. IV. 2.1 samāhitātmā ("self-composed"), AA. III. 2. 1 prepā, samāhitāḥ, and AA. III. 2. 6 atmānam samadādhat (Keith, "put himself together"), saṁadhi implies the ātmamāthuṣak of CU. VII. 25. 2, saṁādā governing ātmānam always referring to the leper yāsas that is to be consummated within you, in the heart. In the arts, saṁādā (cf. āpuṣt, āpuṣṭa) has the analogous value to "fuse" or "weld" or otherwise "fasten together" two different metals, or such incongruous materials as wood and iron (in the latter case with glue, śleṣmaṣa, Viśe, to
“embrace,” in the former by means of a “salt”), and “even so the Comprehensor
heals everything” (suvam bāṣṭyapati) by the utterances (vākuṛtaṇāḥ) śāhur,
bhūnas, seer (the reference of which utterances is to the unions of Agni with
Earth, Vāyu with Space, and the Sun with the Sky), JUR. III. 17, 2, 3.

The grammatical saṁadhi and saṁkhīta are, in fact, only a special case in the
long series of analogous conjunctions discussed in Sā.VII. and VIII. and corre-
sponding passages of AA., and elsewhere. In the case of all these unions the
end in view is an effective harmony and the reproduction of the higher of the
two principles involved. In general the junction is a combination (saṁkhīta) of
the parents in their child (Sā.VII. 10, cf. Taṭṭ. U. I.3), so that, for example,
“science” (vidyā) is the conjunction of Intellect and Voice, Manas and Vāc,
jointly necessary to the expression of any concept of truth (Sā.VIII. 4).

Now in the case of the macrocosmic harp (the seven-rayed Sun) and that of
the analogous human instrument with its seven “breaths,” AV. XV. 15. 2, etc.),
the man himself (cf. A. III. 374. 1, where in the “figure,” siṃhīta, of the harp,
the right tuning of the strings to a mean that is neither too taut nor too slack
 corresponds to the proper adjustment of the man’s forces and faculties, sīrpa
and indriyāṇi: Plato, Rep. 349E, 412A), the combination (saṁkhīta) that is its
“force” (treṣā = bala in Taṭṭ. U. I. 2) is that of the skilled player with the
instrument itself, these two being the formal and efficient causes of the audible
harmony or euphony; we read that “Just as the harp struck by a skilled player
accomplishes the last end (whole reason, raison d’être) of the harp, so the voice
impelled by a skilled speaker accomplishes the last end of the voice” (svam 
sva kuśalena vāctrā vāy ādhibhātā kṛṣṇaṇāḥ vāgarthaḥ śāhayaṇa, Sā.VIII. 10, cf. BG.
II. 59, yogāḥ karmas ca kāsalam), and it is certainly pertinent to the Kingship
that we are told that “He who is a Comprehensor of this divine harp (the seven-
rayed Sun) becomes exceedingly famous; his renown fills the earth; men hearken
to him when he speaks in the assemblies, saying: ‘Let this be done which he
desires’” (Sā.VIII. 9). The speaker, like the King and other artistes, is thought
of as a sādhabha, “one to hit the mark.” Here then is a rhetoric of “the energising
of truth, the bringing to bear of truth upon men” (Baldwin, Medieaval Rhetoric
and Poetic, p. 3). For it is clear that the “last end” of the musical speech is
by no means one of fine sounds for their own sake (for which the voice alone,
uniformed by any meaning would suffice; it has been remarked that “To exerci-
sing freedom of speech one needs only vocal cords”), not what the sense powers
(indriyāṇi) have to offer, not amusement, but that “science without which art
is nothing,” that “science” (vidyā) for which the cooperation of Manas with
Vāc, Inner Sage and Outer King, φιλοσοφία and δόξα, is required, that “meaning
of the Vedas” by which, if one understands it, the Sumnum Romanum (sūkṣma
Mādura) is attainable (Sā.XIV.). We need hardly say that this is also pre-
cisely Plato’s (and the universal) doctrine of the purpose of art: “we are en-
dowed by the Gods with vision and hearing, and harmony was given by the Muses
to him that can use them intellectually (πράποι = manasā), not as an aid to
irrational pleasure (φάντασμα ἄλογος), as is nowadays supposed, but to assist the
soul’s revolution (φύσις πνείναι, cf. vītānṣṭi and cevate), to restore it to order
and concord with itself (i.e. the “Self,” the Inner Man of Phaedrus 279 C). And
because of the want of measure (ἀρίθμος) and the lack of grace in most of us,
rhythm (ῥυθμός = numerum, saṁkhāpyāse) was also bestowed upon us by the same
deities and for the same ends” (Timaeus 47 D. E):...
is the basis of an affect (πάθος) that affords, indeed "pleasure (δόκημα) only to the unintelligent, but to the intelligent (δόξα, connected with φθορά "heart," "mind," and = Skr. sañcādaya) that heart's case (φθοροποιώ) also which is induced by the mimesis of the divine harmony made manifest in mortal motions" (ib. 80 B, echoed in Quintilian's docti rationem componendi intelligenti, cistam indicati colaptatem, IX, 4, 116, and in St. Augustine's depreciation of those "who enjoy what they should use"). Plato's conception of the "whole end of the voice," or more generally of the whole purpose of art (since he regards all craftsmen as "poets," Gorgias 503), is identical with that of the Aranyakas, and it is clear that his "delight," so carefully distinguished from "pleasure," is no more "aesthetic" than is the "savoring of the flavor (rastevādāna) that the Śāhīya Durpaṇā (III-2-3) speaks of as "intelligently heathen" (śamādci, māyā, cf. A.III.354 paramam sannām, ... sukhām anumattam) and as the "twin brother" of the "savoring of Brahma"; rasa corresponding to the "sup" in śānti, "cognition cui amore." In the present context the application is to the art of government, likened to that of music; the end of this art is not the King's pleasure, but his "children's" and his own good. As in any other vocation (acārā) the King is to be governed by his art, not "expressing himself," the instrument, but voicing what has been dictated by the Intellect, veśr (saṁśastra vā, e.g., kirtiyāt, ṢA.VII.2, cf. John VIII.28 and Dante, Purgatorio, XXIV. 52-54), and making the good of the work to be done his only concern (karmāya caevādhikārās te, ṢG. II.47). In the last analysis, God is the skilled player and we the harp of which the "strings" or "senses" must be "regulated."

We begin to see now why the words (re) should be studied (oḍhāya, i.e. like all other symbols, as supports of contemplation, dhyāyasthā) in their samādhi form, that form in which they are sung, and in which alone are they "life-giving" (āyugya, ṢA.VIII.11), i.e. productive of dīrgham āyus: here (the life of 100 years) and hereafter (imperishable immortality). It is because the reconstitution (saṁsāmyāyasthā) of the disintegrated and manifold self effected in the Sacrifice (for which the Chant is absolutely indispensable, ṢS. II.5.8.4) is essentially metrical: "the sacrificer perfects himself as composed of the metres" (chandāvayasthān ca, ... saṁsām samākrutetre, AB. VI.27, Keith's rendering), and is thus a "perfected Self" (saṁyātstham, Taitt. U.II.7): Prajāpati, broken up in the emanation of his children (cf. ṢB.X.5.2.16 on the One and the Many) "unifies himself by means of the metres" (chandobhir atmaṅgaṃ saṁmadhānti, AA.III. 2.8 and ṢA.VIII.11), i.e. "synthesises" the manifold self with the simple Self (the rebel with the rightful sovereign). Similarly, in the saṁādhi of the Yogi astra where there is a reconciliation and "synthesis" of hostile selves, and in the saṁādhi of the Arthasastra where saṁādhi or saṁādhi-karaṇa is the making of a treaty of peace and alliance (also explained as a saṁākṣamana, a term so often employed in connection with marital alliances) between two powers that have been at war, and the converse saṁādhi- or saṁādhi-nokṣa (= saṁādhi-khetra) is the dissolution or breaking of such a treaty and analogous to the grammatical saṁādhi-ekarotana = padaccheda, the "divorce" of fused words; it will be seen that I cannot wholly agree with Edgerton's rendering of saṁādhi by "hostage" (see his "Samādhi, 'Hostage' . . . . ." in JAOS 60:208 ff.) but rather hold that the saṁādhi is a "treaty of peace" commonly ratified or secured by an exchange of gifts or "deposits" (dākita), not excluding those of persons such as a daughter given in marriage (rather as a pledge than as a hostage); the pledges or host-
ages are given when the peace is made, and there is nothing to show that any such hostages were held while the fighting was going on, which hostages could be "released." In any case all these "agreements" are analogous to that of the "two selves" of Mitārvurumāna and all those other aspects of the union of contrary principles, in which there is always an exchange of gifts, each giving something of its own to the other: all these āpāres are makings of harmony and order where discord had been, and we can say with Dionysius (Be dic, num. IV.5) that "all alliances and friendships are because of the beautiful"; this will apply, for example to the "alliance" of words in grammatical saṃdhī, for the metrical saṃhāta texts are assuredly beautiful, the mere words (ṛṇa) being the "evil" of the chant, and kālyāṇa the opposite of pāpaṇa as in pulcher of turpis.

On the other hand, in pada texts the blank space (acakāśa) or moment of time (mātra) "divorces the conjunction" (saṃdhikīm vicāryagati, cf. RV. VI.9.1 ev varṣate rājast and VII.80.1 vicāryayantīkā rājast; and vicitra, "contrasted operation") and divides (vibhajati) or distinguishes (viśīpapayati) the long and short syllables (māstrāsāstrā) and tonic (in Webster's sense 4 b) from "atonic" (svaśāvaram), AA. III.1.5 with ŚA. VII.12. Such a formulation is certainly not meant to be understood only grammatically (grammar itself is a traditional "Way" and "Doctrine"; cf. CU. II. 22-3-5, Tait. Ui. 3.1, and Faddegon, Studies on Pāṇini's Grammar, 1938, pp. 67, 68): the "divorce" of the metrical fused syllables is, as much as the divorce of Sky and Earth, their disaccord and discord: mātra is the quantitative "matter" that fills space, and acakāśa (= akāśa, svarūpā, Sāyaṇa on PB. XVIII.9.6) the luminous sphere that intervenes between the Earth and Sky; mātra and acakāśa can be taken to refer to what has measure or number and what has not (the distinction of poetry from prose); while the distinction of svara (tone, tone, music, "the gold of the chant," BU.I. 3.25,26) from what is savāra (toneless noise)—in ŚA. I mean to savārā svārām to agree with AA. svav̄rāsvaṃ—can be equated with that of the intoned (svav̄ra) chant from the toneless libretto (ṛṇa, "the evil of the chant," JUB.I.16.10) and furthermore with that of solar light from mundane darkness (it can hardly be conveyed in English that svav̄ra implies both "tone" and "light," though we can speak of a "brilliant tone," and Dante spoke of "singing suns"). Strong confirmation of these interpretations can be found in a correlation of AA. II.3.6 where we are told that "vain talk is unmeasured" (vr̥tād vṛt tad omōtum)—we understand this to mean at once "unnatural" and "immoderate"—with JB. II.69, 70, 73 where in the sacrificial contest between Prajāpati and Death "what was sung or danced to the harp by way of mere entertainment" (vr̥tād = mōgham, " vainly," in the corresponding text of SB. III.2.4.6) by Death is "numbered" (saṃākhyānam) and "deadly" (martīyan), and what by Prajāpati "numbered" (saṃākhyānam) and "lively" (omōtum), and Death's music is now our secular art of the "parlor" (paññūlala), "whatever people sing to the harp, or dance or do to please themselves" (vr̥tād); and with SB. III.2.4.1-6 where the mundane Devas (iḥa deśā) contest with the celestial (dīvi) Gandharvas for the possession of Vāc; the Gandharvas say to her: "We are declaring the Vedas, we know, indeed we know" (vai vaivād idāma, cf. SB. XI.2.3.7), but the mundane Devas: "We will amuse thee" (vai prāmodayiṣyāmaka): Vāc is seduced by the sensitive Devas, "and that is why even nowadays women are wedded to folly" (mōghasaṃākhyātā); but finally won by the Gandharvas from them. The word prāmodayiṣyāmaka is reflected below (16) in the expression prakāmaṇḍya
"aesthetic, or appetitive conversation," evidently contrasting with brahmodya, "godly conversation" or "Brahmanical colloquy" (see Bloomfield in JAOS 15, 184 and Caland on PB. IV. 9. 12); the distinction of celestial Gandharvas from the mundane Devas is the same as that of the brāhmaṇagandharvās from the devāḥ in TS. VI. 1. 6. 5. 6, that of the devīkṣit from the lokākṣit Devas in CU. II. 24. 14, and that of the Devas whose spokesman is the Sacrifice from the Asuras—the unregenerate sense-powers, prabhṛṣṭha, indriyāṇi—in SB. III. 2. 1. 18 where also the contest is for Vāc; the mundane Devas are of those who "can only approach Vāc in sin" in the sense of RV. X. 71. 9. The distinction of such an "unmodulated vain conversation" (erythē vāk . . . avātā) from the "Chant commensurate with the spiritual-Self" (ātmasam-śūlitam . . . ātma, CU. II. 10. 1), "commensurate with the Imperishable" (aksarasmāmānas . . . ātma, SB. VIII. 5, i.e. with the syllable Om, with Brahman, not Keil's "letters"), is very evident. Sāyaṇa's explanation of erythē vāk in AA. II. 3. 6 is "non-Brahmanical interpretations (i.e. 'free examination'; agata is very literally "unauthorised," "not fathered by") and humorous anecdotes and so forth told at court or other such like places" (brāhmaṇagata ye'rithvaiḍā ā ca rājasabdhādau parīkṣāddīrśupacocyaite).

The sacred "science of the celestial Gandharvas" (who know better than the Rishis what is too much or too little in the Sacrifice, SB. XI. 2. 3. 7) and "science" (vidya) of Ā. VII. 15, must not be equated with our profane science, but with "metaphysics" (cf. René Guénon, "Deux sciences" in La crise du monde moderne, 1927, and La métaphysique orientale, 1939; Gaigneron, La connaissance interdite, 1935). An accumulation of knowledge for its own sake, to satisfy a curiosity, is as much as gossip, vaudeville, or any merely sentimental art or "art for art's sake," a "profanity" (erythē vāk): we say "profanity" here with reference to the opposition of profane to sacred (tegā, brahman), and the fact that erythē, from vṛtṛ, to "choose," is the semiotic equivalent of "heretical," from alpē (alpēsan), to "choose for oneself": the man who can boast, or even admit that "I do not know what is right, I know what I like to do; I do not know what is true, but what I like to think; and I do not know anything about art, but know what I like" is in the strictest sense of the word a "heretic," one who however "well-intentioned" is nevertheless "opinionated" and "unprincipled."

Stated in other words, there is a distinction of a significant (padārthābhikṣaya) and liberating (visuṣṭi) art—the art of those who singing here to the harp are celebrating Him, the Golden Person, in both his natures, immanent and transcendent—from an insignificant art "colored by worldly passion" (lokākṣa-rājaśa) and "dependent on the mood" (bhāvārṇya); the former is the "highway" (mūrga) and the later a "pagan" (deśi) art (CU. I. 7. 6-9 with Saṃgītāvaraṇya, I. 4-6 and Daśārṇya, I. 12-14). The distinction of mūrga from deśi is not, of course, one of fine from applied or of high from folk art, but of the traditional art that follows up the main track to its destination at "World's End" from a naturalistic art that wanders off the main road "in all directions": the root meanings present in deśi are to "display," and "all directions" (deśi dīśi, cf. dīśi dīsas, "hither and thither"), whence deśa "country" or "environment," "outlandish parts" as distinguished from the "heart" of the kingdom, while pāgae is also "country" and "pagan," "outlandish," and thus heterodox. The "pagan" art by which we are seduced, i.e. led off or led away from the relatively "narrow" Way is essentially feminine: cf. SB. III. 2. 1. 22 where the Devas (Gandharvas) remark that "Vāc is a woman" (yogd), and are fearful "lest she
ensnare" (nā yuvitā; cf. RV. I.105.2 where Trite laments śājyad yuvate pāttinā) the Sacrifice, her sutor on their behalf. This fear is, of course, the basis of the Indian, Islamic, and Christian "puritanism," which must not be misinterpreted to the discredit of all art and is a disparagement only of the profane arts of amusement, of mere diversion, Plato's "art of flattery." There is obviously no disparagement of the Cantor who sings of the Sun on his harp by means of the "Thresfold Science" (traya vidyā, i.e. "bhūr bhūvās acar," JUB.I.58.1, 2; II. 9.7; III.18.4), the harpists whose song is "of Him," the Person in the Sun, the lord of these worlds therunder and of men's desires, and so singing win both worlds (CU.I.7.6, L.11), or of the art (ādīpa) of dancing, singing, and instrumental music referred to in KB.XXIX.3; no disparagement of scripture with its "figures of thought," but only of "literature" with its "figures of speech"; none of "poetry," but only an affirmation of its real values (ārīkha), a justification of such "scientific" poets as Dante who, with his dottrina che s'asconde sotto il velame degli versi strani, and confessed amanuensis of Eros, was no more than any Vedic Rishi or mastraśīṛt a litterateur, but a soothsayer, satyasāda.

And just as there is no disparagement of art as such, so in the so-called misogynyism of the texts there is no more disparagement of woman as such than there is of kings as such; the disparagement is of an effeminacy to which both are liable by a perversion of their naturally and therefore properly "erotic" nature: a disparagement of monarchy, like that of the spiritual power, is an altogether modern development, essentially proletarian and "materialistic." It is not "this woman," but the feminine, or rather effeminate, principle which, when it follows its own devices, makes pleasure its end, is rejected, whether in woman or man, subject or king. We are all of us, like Aditi-Vāc, "double-headed" (ubhayatāsātārapāya), having one tongue "worshipful and regal" (kṣatriyā hy ējā pujyāye) that enunciates the Gudon (dākṣāyinā) of the Sacrifice, the wisdom (vidyā) by which the whole end of Speech, and immortality, are won; and another that perverts the Truth (SB.III.2.4.16 with JUB.IV.19.4); the latter is condemned, but not the tongue as such.

We realise now that art can have, not only "fixed ends," but also "ascertained means of operation"; that it is not only for those who sing here to sing of Him, but to sing as He sings. On the one hand, a proseic, historical and anecdotal, sentimental and humanistic interpretation of "scripture as literature," or of any traditional symbol, whether auditory or visual, is a deadly error (cf. S.1.11), the defect of Plutarch's Greeks, who could not distinguish between Apollo and Helios, and because of which many learned Indians have thought of European scholarship as a "crime." On the other it is clear that our substitution of stress for tone, our "expressive" and informal manner of reading and singing—so different from the measured "singsong" of traditionally spoken verse—are essentially profane developments characteristic of an age that can no longer think of song as an evocative or creative (śāsāntaś) art in any literal sense of the words, or of the Sacrifice as necessary for our daily bread. We realise the significance of the fact that prose has been a late development in literary history; ours is a prose style, while the traditional lore of all peoples—even the substance of their practical sciences—has been everywhere poetical. The prosaic and pedes- trian language of the "pada text" is the analytical language of fact, the intoned poetry or "incantation" the language of truth; intonation is analogous to information. It can hardly be said of us that our music is "an earthly representa-
rāši). Thou art the body, protect thou my body from this Great Dread" (aśmān mahābhayaḥ . . . tanvam me pāhi).

tion of the music that there is in the rhythm of the ideal world" or that our "crafts such as building and carpentry take their principles from that realm and from the thinking there" (Plotinus, Enneads, V.9.11), or that we "make all things according to the pattern that was shown thee upon the mount" (Exodus, XXV.40), or that "our songs are the same as His songs" (Cf.I.7.5); for like all other animals, we know what we like; and over and above this, have invented a science of likes and dislikes—properly styled a "psychology"— and have substituted this "aesthetic" for the traditional conception of art as an "intellectual virtue." Thus we said that saṃdhi, whether grammatical, erotic, or technical, was "for the sake of harmony, or euphony," this did not mean "for aesthetic reasons," for the love of fine sounds or the mere satisfaction of longings (the traditional union has other and practical ends in view, so that a man sins if he desires even his own wife "as a woman, and not because she is his wife," and it is not upon a "failing in love" but on qualifications that the marriage of king and priest depends). The point is that discord is sterile, preventing "good use," concord effective. If the texts are to be made "enchancing" (cf. Plato, Laws 659 E), this is not in the modern sense of the word but in that sense in which the Cantor (the Udgātā, assimilated to the Sun, see JAOS 60, 1940, p. 49, note 12; the harpist whose songs are a mimicry of the solar music of the spheres, CUI.1.7.5) is strictly speaking an Enchanter, voicing words of power, a chanticleer announcing the morning. If the intoned (svarya) text is actually also more "charming" than the prosaic reading (this time "charming" in the modern sense), this charm was not their first intention or last end; the aesthetic value of the incantation, so artfully constructed, is indeed an undeniable value, not however the value of a raison d'être, but that of "the pleasure that perfects the operation." A good example of the principle can be cited in the case of the lotus wreath, called a "work of art" or rather "symbol": (alpa), that Prajāpati wears "for supremacy" and which he bequeathes to Indra, who thereupon becomes an all-conqueror (PB.XVI.4.3-5); this wreath is assuredly an "ornament" in the word's original sense of "equipment"; it is not worn "for effect" but to be effective. Conversely, those whose language is acid (anirvan, in-sapient) are thought of as imarmed (RV.IV.5.14). Cf. my "Ornament" in Art Bulletin, XXI, 1939.

We find it strange that, with the exception of Gonda, students of Indian rhetoric have completely neglected the older and also the Buddhist material on the "purpose of speech."

48 For purāna Śāyaṇa has grāmāḥ "villages," but this does not mean, as Keith suggests in a footnote, "villages in the kingdom"; the fact is that one of these "villages" is the kingdom, and that only the word "here" signifies "in this kingdom." The "villages" are those of Sky and Earth, as in CUI.VIII.6.2 where the Two Worlds are grāman, "two villages"; cf. SB.X.2.5.1 "These worlds, indeed, are cities" (pūrāṇa). In JUB.I.53.33 the Two Worlds are ṣāyulam; in AB.IV.27 the Purohit is the King's ṣāyulam. In TS.III.4.7.3 the Two Worlds are upāri grāha ṭa ca, "the upper house and this one here below," the latter being the same as the adhāra grāha of AV.II.14.3 and the same as the one village in our text that is "here." In JIR.I.145 (cf. PB.VII.10.3 and AB.IV.27) the effect of the "divine marriage" of the Two Worlds is that "now they
That these words, to which Sāyaṇa refers as the rājñāḥ purohitāvaranā-
dwail in one another’s house” (aṣṇaṃṣaṇaṃ grāḥ), or “in the house that belongs
to both,” and it is as hard to see why Caland (Das Śāṁsiṇaḥ Brahmāṇa in
Avadāka, p. 47) found the plural (cavaṣṭi) so strange (what of the plural in
“They twain shall be one flesh”? Cf. Vidyāpati’s “Each is both”) as it is to
see why Keith (who ignores the marital force of TS.Ⅰ.3.7 and IV.2.5.1) should
have thought that Sāyaṇa had overlooked the marital force of the formula in
AB.Ⅷ.27.

In TS.Ⅳ.2.5.1 the formula for the marriage of the two Agnis (the brahma
and the aṣṭra, ib. V.2.4.1-2) concludes with the words bhāvatiṣyante naḥ śaṃṣaṇaṃ∗
saṃkaṣṇaṇaḥ, found also in TS.Ⅰ.3.7 where they are addressed to the firesticks
identified with Urvaśi and Pururavas as the parents of Ayu-Agni, and this re-
flects RV.Ⅹ.65.8 where “Sky and Earth, environing parents, cohabit and co-
oprate” (prīktiḥ pitārāḥ...saṃkaṣṇaḥ dyuṣā_pythiṣṭeḥ...saivrate).

There is a very significant parallel here between the Sanskrit and the Greek
sources. In the first place the two words pur (or pura) “city,” and saṃkaṣṇa
(Yow, to “be apt for”), “living in one house with” are the etymological equiva-
Icents of Greek πόλις and συνοικία. Both the Sanskrit and the Greek sources speak
of man as a “city”; for example, man’s body is a “city indwelt by God”
(brahmapura, CU.Ⅷ.1.1, Mund. Up.Ⅱ.2.7—the term also meaning “city
of God,” i.e. Heaven), the head is the body’s ᾱσπασμός (Timoecus 70 A). Further-
more, just as Sky and Earth are to be “cohabitant” (saṃkaṣṇaḥ) “here,” so the
divine, daimonic, immortal part of the soul is said to “live in one house with
(syνοικία, Timoecus 90 A,C, etc.) the mortal part of the soul: and if Plato does
not expressly interpret this to mean a cohabitation of male and female principles,
such a distinction is certainly latent in the fact that the two principles are
are for him by nature respectively the dominant and the obedient.

To resume, there can be no possible doubt that in our context the puraṣṭi,
“cities,” Sāyaṇa’s grāmāḥ, are Sky and Earth, the city of God and the city
of man.

∗The two “forms” or “bodies” (tvaṃ) of the Purohita and the King corre-
spend to the “two forms” (dvam...tvanāḥ) of Mitrāvarūpa in RV.Ⅶ.67.5,
and to their “two selves” or “two persons” in SB.Ⅳ.1.4.1. In PB.Ⅶ.10.3
it is by means of their “two dear bodies” (prīpti tvaṃṣaḥ), the saṃkhaṇa and
śyāṭa, metres, that the divine marriage (daivas withumasa) of Sky and Earth
(byudraḥkāṃṣa) is consummated, the union being effected by an exchange
of verse endings. For this kind of “transposition of forms” in marriage, com-
parable with the Hāhāb of the later rhetoricisms, cf. PB.Ⅶ.10.3 sipatikvā-
matiḥ—JB.Ⅰ.145 ṣvetāḥvaṭam. In AB.Ⅷ.27 a reading of saṃvihāraḥ (for
saṃvihāraḥ) would scarcely affect the meaning; cf. Caland on vinaḥkār in
JB.Ⅰ.145 (JB. in Avadāka, pp. 46, 47). The transposition and mingling of
hymns in the ritual (e.g. AB.Ⅵ.25 sākṣeḥ paravoṣṣāṇī, ou eva tov ran vihāraḥ) is
always a commingling of contrasted forms with a view to a propagation; and
there is something in the assimilation of the King and Priest to one another that
is quite analogous to this.

∗It is by a curious coincidence that this word saṃkaṣṇaḥ, if analysed as saṃ-
kaṣṇaḥ would mean “sharing one vehicle,” cf. saṃ-vaḥ to “drive off together,”
with a view to “living together” (saiv-vaḥ).
The context in our text refers to the King's person and to the Purohitas's parallel in TS.V.I.1.1.3. "Thou art the body of (King) Soma, protect thou my body." Just as Indra, King in divinities, is evtasapo, "Fidei Defensor," and becomes the Buddha's protector from the time of the Buddha's Awakening and Enthronement onwards, so the human King is bhakmanadadha goptā. ... dharmasya goptā, AB.VIII.17. For an exchange of bodies and names, and transvestment, cf. TS.I.3.4.3 and I.5.10.1.

"Taken alone, this seems to mean "Formula for the King's choice of the Purohita," cf. RV.V.50.1 "Let every mortal choose (curita) the God's, the Leader's (i.e. Savi't's) fellowship," X.21.1 apast ... kātārām te id evaṁkame, and III.62.10 evaṁkame "choiceworthy," qualifying Savi't's Splendor. In any case the choice is mutual (cf. SB.IV.1.4.6.6); each "takes" the other in the sense that "take" is used in the Christian marriage service. In RV.X.124.4 where Agni "chooses" (eyastah) Indra it is, of course, to be understood that Indra also "chooses" Agni, as in TS.II.5.2.3. This reciprocal relationship is paralleled in the ambiguity of the much discussed text of KU.II.23, of which the real theme is that of the sacred marriage to be effected within you (cf. BU.IV.3.21). In KU.II.23 it is a matter of the "taking" (Viśākā, which has also an erotic sense) of the Self by the Self, but it is uncertain which "Self" is the subject of "chooses" (eyate, Vṛ, meaning also to "woo") in the third line. We assume, with most of the translators, that eṣa refers back to ayam ātmā (the Self) as subject. However this may be, the problem whether or not eṣa eyate implies a "doctrine of Divine Grace and ... personal God." (Rawson) does not depend on the grammar here. If we regard the choice or wooing of the lower principle by the higher as an "act of grace," then it goes without saying that a doctrine of "Grace" and a sense of personal relationship with the divine Eros had been taught and felt long before the time of KU. Nor is there any opposition between the doctrines of a personal and an impersonal deity: "personal and impersonal" (paurnapāpaurnapya)—like abibdābdā, käladāla, perimēperimē, etc.—is only one of the many ways of describing the divine dvāsīthākara.

In this connection it must not be overlooked that a doctrine of Grace implies also one of Disgrace: "He causes him whom he wishes to lead up from these worlds to perform right acts, and whom he wishes to lead downwards to perform wrong acts" (Kaus. U.III.8).* If this appears to deny our moral responsibility (the akīriyevadā herey, attributed also to the Amaurians, see HJAS.IV.119 f.), and cf. St. Augustine, De spir. et lit. 60), the answer is that the freedom of choice is ours to ask what boon we will (vartaṇa evaṁ yāṁ kāmāṁ kāmaṇyo tatu) and that whoever prays sincerely in the words of the "Elevation" (abhūreka), "Lead me from what is unrighteous to what is righteous (asato ad asato guneas), from darkness to light, from death to immortality" assuredly obtains his desire (BU.I.3.28). In other words, the Lord bestows his Grace on those who "choose" his leading, and "disgraces" those who do not seek it. In the same way the King may or may not "choose" the guidance of a qualified Purohita; in our text it is clear that the choice has been made, and the spoken words are those of the Purohita expressing his acceptance of the King whom he will "cause to perform right acts," and therefore to prosper.

* Cf. Hermelitus, Fr. XLIV.
be said to have been proved by the already accumulated evidence of the masculinity of the Sacrectodium with respect to the Regnum. That amo 'ham asmi must have been spoken by the Priest is further confirmed by the fact that in CU. V. 2.6 the would-be King addresses the Fire (the archetype of the Purohita) with the words amo nāmi 'si, "Thy name is 'That' (or 'He')," cf. CU. VI. 1.1 "Śā is This (Earth), ama is Agni." That it is the Purohita that utters the words "I am That (or He)" is stated explicitly by Sāyana (AB. VIII. 27, Commentary, Bīd. Ind., 1896, IV. 288, line 8, purohitāḥ aham aham). Sāyana also makes it clear that the whole of the rest of this section, beginning yā osadhī . . . , is likewise spoken by the Purohita, who thus consecrates the seat given to him by the King and at the same time blesses the realm. The Purohita is the "man" and the King the "woman." Observe that it is to the King that the words "Bear thou rule" (tvām vi rāja) are addressed in AV. III. 4.1, and that it is with reference to a wife that the words "let her bear rule" (vi rājatu) are spoken in AV. II. 36. 3.

The essential purpose of the Divine Marriage, in which the Priest and King are the representatives of Sky and Earth, is apotropaic of Death, and especially Famine (cf. BU. I. 2.1, aśanāyā hi mṛtyūḥ). The words of the text reflect the refrain vākṣatalam . . . na ābhava of RV. I. 185, addressed to Sky and Earth, Day and Night. It is by means of the Divine Marriage and the Sacrifice that Death is averted from the kingdom, as we saw in note 34, citing JB. II. 419. The marriage is an insurance against the Privation (abhava) of RV. I. 185, "the Great Dread, the uplifted bolt" (mahābhāyaṁ vajram udyalam) of KU. VI. 2, the uplifted bolt (the millstone), dreaded by Sky and Earth, ŚB. III. 9. 4. 18, the Great Fear of BG. II. 40, the "fear" (bhayam) of Taitt. Up. II. 7, cf. Sn. 1033 "the Great Dread, the woe of this world" (dakkhham asa mahābhayaṁ) : just as Sky and Earth (where they have been reconciled) are not afraid, nor are hurt, so the brahma and the kṣatra are not afraid nor are hurt, and one says: "Be not afraid, O thou breath-of-my-life" (AV. II. 15. 1, 4). The congress of Mitra-varna, Dyāvaprthivi, brahma-kṣatrau is an aversion of the "wrath" (mānyu) of Varuna, or rather a conversion by which he is made a Friend (Mitra).42

44 Cf. TS. I. 9. 7. 4 "The sacrificer is a bolt (vajra), the enemy (khrātvyaṁ) of man is want (kṣudram); in that he fasts and does not eat, he straightway smites with a bolt, the enemy, want."; similarly II. 5. 6. 6.

45 In an analysis of the ruling passions of the various human kinds or castes in A. III. 363 it is interesting to compare those attributed to the Kṣatriya with those attributed to women: both lists of qualities end in the same way, "his vocation is to rule" (iṣṭriya pariyośana), and "her vocation is to rule." The word pariyośana (Skr. pari-asya-asya); almost literally "tie-up" or "connection,"
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The primary expression of the "wrath" is in drought, the precursor of famine. Prior to the marital reunion of Sky and Earth "there was

means vocation, function, entelechy, goal, as may be seen from the fact that in the same context the Samaña's pariyosana is nibbāna, and the Householder's (whose "support is an art") is "perfected work." It is not meant that it is the Kṣatriya's and woman's mere ambition to rule, but that it pertains to them to do so. In other words, the characteristically royal and feminine function is that of administration; the one administering a kingdom, the other a household (cf. Proverbs, XXXI.10 f.); it is well known that the Indian woman, in fact, "rules" the house. In both cases, of course, the administrative function implies the presence of another and authoritative principle, on behalf of which the administrator acts.

There is another way in which the King and the woman correspond; both are "devoted." We have already seen that the King's patronage of the Brähman corresponds to Indra's bestowal of his "share" (bhadā, RV.VIII.100.1; cf. note 5) on Agni, and that this offering makes the King a Bhakti; it is in the same way that the wife offers his share of the meal to her husband before partaking of what is left, the remains of her sacrifices. It would be as "incorrect" for her to eat with him as it would be for the King to eat with his Purohita.

It is by no means an accident, or merely historical "development" that "the doctrine of bhakti" should have been so little emphasized in the Upaniṣads and so much in BG. For it is the Way of Gnosis (jñānamārga) that pertains to the Brähman, and the emotional Way of Devotion (bhaktimārga), which is also a Way of Sacrificial Action (karmamārga), that pertains to the King. The relation of a vassal to a feudal lord, which is also that of the Regnum to the Sacerdotium, is essentially one of "loyalty" (a word that better than "devotion," perhaps, conveys the meaning of bhakti), and that is precisely the relation of the woman to the man, her "lord"; there is a real equivalence of the Japanese Amakiri and the Indian sati, and it is in the same way that the "soul" (always f.) must "put itself to death" for the sake of the spirit to which it owes allegiance.

We can see all this as clearly in the connection of European Chivalry (kastren) with a devotional mysticism, and in the corresponding Sōtō devotional literature, with its "Fidélès de l'Amour," as in India. As has been pointed out by René Guénon, "Nous ne pouvons que signaler ... le rôle important que joue le plus souvent un élément féminin, ou représenté symboliquement comme tel, dans les doctrines des Kshatriyas ... Ce fait peut s'expliquer, d'une part, par la prépondérance de l'élément 'rajasique' et émotif chez les Kshatriyas, et surtout, d'autre part, par la correspondance du féminin, dans l'ordre cosmique, avec Prakriti ou 'La Nature primordiale, principe du devenir et de la mutation temporelle' (Autorité spirituelle et Pouvoir temporel, 1930, p. 92, note 1).

The Sacerdotium and the man are the intellectual, and the Regnum and the woman the active elements in what should be literally a symphony. Over against the intellectual and continence that are proper to the former, the emotional and erotic qualities of the latter are, in due proportion, necessary and indispensable to society; for without the softer wool to be combined with the harder wool, the social tissue could not be woven at all. But it must also be realised that in any normal decadence (such as that of the last centuries in Europe),
no rain, no warmth, the Five Folk were at variance” (na samajānata, AB. IV. 27); it is a consequence of the marriage of the Purohita and the King that the people are unanimous (vishāh samajānate, AB. VIII. 27). So when the separation of Sky and Earth, the act of “creation” essential to life but also involving death, had first been effected, “The Gods all waited, and called upon the Āśvins to ‘Reunite them’ (pūnar d vahalāt, RV. X. 24. 5) so “the Gods led them together (samanaya, as the Queen is ‘led’ in the Āśvamedha), and coming together, they performed this Divine Marriage” (sanyayantāv elam devavivaḥam vyavahetām, AB. IV. 27) and as in VS. II. 16 “Consent ye together (sajjanathām), Sky and Earth; aid ye us with rain.”

For if Varuna is, in himself, a god of drought and privation (see note 23), on the other hand Mitrāvarṇau jointly are typically “rain-gods,” as in RV. V. 63, 68, and 69; and if their cosmic and earthly equivalents, Sky and Earth, Priest and King, are likewise jointly rain-givers, this too depends upon the marital association and cooperation of the contrasted principles: the King, in other words, is directly responsible for the fertility of the land; the fall of rain in due season depends upon his rightousness or default.

ŚB. I. 8. 3. 12 adds to VS. II. 16 cited above, “for when Sky and Earth consent (or ‘know’ one another), then indeed it rains,” explaining that Mitra-varṇau as pradāpānu are the same as that Vāyu, the Gale, “who is the ruler in the rain” (yō varśasyeśe); similarly AA. III. 1. 2 where “the conjunction (samādi) of Sky and Earth is rain, Parjanya the conjoiner” (samādha); cf. RV. VII. 101. 6 where Parjanya, identified with the solar Ātman, is the inseminator of the (three) “Everlasting-Dawns” (retodha . . . sāsvatām), and Taitt. Up. I. 3. 3 where Vāyu is the conjoiner (samādha) of Sky and Earth; just as the Priest, by means of the sacrificial ritual “conjoins” (samadadhāt) Earth, Vāyu, and Āditya with Earth, Air, and Sky (ŚA. I. 5), which is “a coupling of three with three for progeny” (tisās tirsvedhīr utthundha prajātyai, TB. I. 2. 1. 8). With reference to all these marriages, and their reflection here (tasmād idānim puruṣasya karivā pratisamhitāni, JUB. III. 4. 6; pravasiyān saṃ virāhah āpnoti ya evaṁ vedā, PB. VII. 10. 4), one may well say “What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”

the progressive “emancipation” of the less intellectual and more emotional elements in the community will mean the gradual substitution of feeling for knowing as a basis for judgment in conduct or art. In ethics, the notion of altruism will take the place of that of justice; in literature, words will more and more be used for their emotive effect than treated as the vehicle of thought. We ultimately reach just such a condition of sentimentality as is characteristic of modern societies; and it need hardly be pointed out that if the social tissue is to be woven entirely of the softer elements, it cannot be expected to wear well.
Thus, while "there was no rain" so long as Sky and Earth were estranged, the text goes on to say that, when the marriage has been made, "they enlivens (jinaenti) one another; with the smoke (of the Sacrifice) this world enlivens that (world); with rain that (world) enlivens this" (AB.IV.27); the seminal union is effected with RV.I.159, wherewith the Priest fertilises Sky and Earth (dyavāprthivyā rāsam dadhāti, cf. rasā in RV.I.106.2) and "it is upon these two, thus saturated (rāsamalāb, that these children live (upajīvantā) as means of subsistence" (upajīvanlye, SB.IV.3.2.12). So in TS.III.5.3.1 "'Quickens the Sky,' he says; verily, to these worlds he announces the Sacrifice... verily, he wins rain." Similarly in PB.VII.10.3; and in JB.I.145 where because of the separation of Sky and Earth "Gods and men hungered (abandāyan): for the Gods live by what is given hence, and men by what is given thence." "... 'Let us be wedded' (vivahāvahai), they said....

"'O Agni, the wise one, do thou avert for us the anger of Varuna, the God." (RV.IV.1.4, TS.II.5.12.3); "May be (Agni) save us from the overwhelming duress, the curse, the overwhelming wrong... from Varuna's craft" (RV.I.128.5.7); "Thou, Agni, hast freed the Gods from their curse" (RV.VII.13.21); and similar texts. By the same token, Brahmā is the "remitter of debts."

"JR.III.206 "The Gods to whom no offering is made do not eat": PB.XIV.6.8 (Indra addressing Kutas) "Offer a Sacrifice to me, for I am hungry."

As Keith has pointed out (HOB XXXI.239) the basis of the Sacrifice is an exchange of gifts. We find the Sacrifice saying: "Give thou to me: I shall give to thee... Accept my offering, I shall accept thy offering" (TS.I.8.4.1), and "With what goods (dānsena) I barter, seeking goods with goods, may that become more for me, not less" (AV.III.15.5.6); "What the Sacrificer does for the Gods here, that they do for him there" (JB.I.233); "Indra does not rob his worshipper, but returns his gifts more abundantly" (RV.VI.28.2), cf. AV.III.15.1 where Indra is called a "trader" (vāpijanam) and as such contrasted with the "miser" (ārātmā). This is, indeed, a commerce of man with God, but in the primary sense of the word, that of establishing personal relationships (Webster, 2), rather than in that of our modern "business." Even today the Indian shopkeeper is apt to ask: "Do you think I am in business only for profit?" The transaction is paralleled in the lavish exchanges of useful gifts which we meet with us a worldwide practice in "primitive" societies where, at the same time that the actual benefits of a "trade" are secured, the main purpose is that of the cementing of friendly and reciprocal relations. An enduring friendship, all on one side and without reciprocity of any kind, would be unreal.

The commerce of the Do ut des texts is, moreover, identical with that implied by the term bhakti—bhāga, literally "share" or "portion," from bhājey to "apportion." Thus in RV.X.81.8 Agni only consents to conduct the Sacrifice on condition of receiving his "portion" of the oblation (jarīṇa datta bhāgām), cf.II.16.6 where the Sacrificer thinks of himself, as winning "wealth" (dānaśāh) by his invocation. As we have seen (note 5, c. e.), and as is also evident from the fact that the sacrificial commerce is really an exchange of wedding gifts, the implied agreement or mutual understanding (sāmājāna) has as much to do with
Yonder world thence gave the Dawn to this world as a marriage gift, and this world hence the Smoke (of the morning Sacrifice); yonder

love as with advantage. A man does not “love” his wife the less because he “provides for” her and she “serves” him or his, as we are God’s, to “love, honor and obey him.” It is the same in feudal relations, where the “devotion” of thane to Earl (as in Beowulf) is of just the same sort as that of the woman to the man or the man to God. If love be literally a “lik[en]ing,” we cannot really love anyone, other than one whose will we do, or one who does our will.

The Sacrifice is a “devotion,” and that is as much as to say a self-sacrifice; and in fact, while the God is archetypally the victim, in the ritual minnes the Sactificer identifies himself with the actual victim, as is often explicit: “the Fire knows that he has come to give himself to me” (pariṣṭā me, S.B. II. 4.1.11, cf. IX.3.2.7 yajñā tathā devānām ātmāḥ, yajñā u cil yājantvayya), and hence the “self-sacrificer” (ātmaprati) from the mere “sacrificer,” S.B. XI.2.6.13-14, cf. Eegeling’s note on S.B. I.2.3.5. In the last analysis, the Sacrificer is exchanging or, if we prefer to say so, “bartering” his own eye for the Sun’s, his own for the divine substance.

The language of commerce, in fact, survives in the most characteristically devotional contexts, for example in Mirā Bāi’s well known song:

Kāhn have I bought. The price he asked, I gave.
Some cry, “Tis great,” and others jeer “Tis small”—
I gave in full, weighed to the utmost grain,
My love, my life, my self, my soul, my all.

It would be very difficult to show that it was in any other spirit that the Sacrificer made himself over to Agni. It is only our own bias that stands in the way of a realisation of the real content. If the virtue of self-sacrifice is, no more than any other virtue, “its own reward” but is with a view to results (“Thine may we be, for thee to give us treasure,” RV. II. 2.1), the last end in view being that of a rebirth from the Fire in an immortal body of glory, this consciousness of ends, whether here or hereafter (metaphysical rites have always in view to secure both of these ends), no more implies a “loveless” relationship than does a feudal or marital “contract.”

We must not be distracted from a realisation of this by the unquestionable fact that, as Keith has rightly pointed out, the sacrificial gift is by no means a thank-offering, or by the fact that there is no word in Hindi for “thanks.” The Indian point of view is that we do not say “thanks”; we do something about it. The beggar who receives alms offers no thanks; he has favored the giver with an opportunity to be generous. The whole stress, indeed, is upon the aristocratic virtue of generosity, not on the servile expression of gratitude. Our notion that “Virtue is its own reward,” so far from being admirable, is only the expression of a cynical disbelief in an ultimate order and justice, a distrust in man’s or God’s magnanimity. In all interpretation of the Vedic Sacrifice by European scholars there must always be discounted their (often unconscious) anti-traditional, and especially anti-feudal and anti-clerical, prejudices.

“Caland, in annotation of PB. VII.10.3 renders dānās by “tug” and so misses the whole point. It is because all gifts are essentially sacrifices that “A gift is given with the words ‘This is smoke’” (JU.B. I.58.6). Nothing more profound than this has ever been said about giving.
world thence gave the Rain to this world as a marriage gift, and this world hence the Divine Service (devayajna, the Sacrifice to the Gods) to that world.” So when it rains hard all day and night men say: “Earth and Sky have united” (samadhātām; AA.III.1.2).

We can understand better now the traditional and world-wide doctrine that the very life and fertility of the realm depend upon the King,49 to whom accordingly it is said: “For our bread (urjē) art thou, for rain unto us art thou, for our paternity of offspring (prajānaṁ . . . dāhīpatya; pali here as in ‘Prajāpati’), . . . for all this have we aspersed (abhyaśicāmaḥ) thee” (ŚB.IX.3.3.11). For unless the King fulfills his primary function as Patron of the Sacrifice (vajamāna), the circulation of the “Shower of Wealth (vāsor dhārā), the limitless, inexhaustible food of the God” that falls from the Sky as Rain and is returned from the Earth to the Sky in the smoke of the burnt-offering will be interrupted (ŚB.IX.3.3.15,16):50 that man’s offerings are transmitted to

48 “It is upon the observance of ritual that the governance of a State depends” (Confucius, Analects, XI.25). “Wherever the idea of divine kingship prevails we find coupled with it the conviction that upon the correct performance of kingly ritual depends the whole welfare of the State, the fertility of its lands, the fruitfulness of its trees, the fecundity both of its women and of its herds and flocks” (Waley, The Analects of Confucius, p. 65). Waley further points out that the “power that enabled Divine Kings to deal with all things under Heaven” depended not only upon the correct performance of the rites but also upon an understanding of them; this is just as it is in the Indian texts where it is only to the Comprehensor (evam eva) that the ultimate benefits of any given rite really accrue.

49 In ŚB.IX.3.2.1 and 4 the Shower of Wealth (vāsor dhārā) is both “Agni’s Shower” (maam as he is the Vaṣu, and also the “Shower of Wealth” with which he is aspersed (abhyaśikta) as Emperor. ŚB.IX.3.3.15-19 explains its nature: “its self or body (ātmāna) is the sky, the cloud its under, lightning its tend, the shower the shower (of rain); from the Sky it comes to the cow (i.e. from the Sky as archetypal cow to the earthy cow, so that on earth), its self or body is the cow . . . its shower the shower (of milk); and from the cow it comes to the Sacrifice. He (in turn) in its self or body, his arm its under, the offering ladle its tend, the shower the shower (of ghee). From the Sacrifice to the Gods; from the Gods to the cow; from the cow to the Sacrifice; thus circulates this perpetual, never ending food of the Gods. And, verily, whoever is a Comprehensor thereof, for him shall there be thus this perpetual never-ending Food” (the Bread of Life). See also TS.V.4.8 and 7.3.

This same “circulation” is more briefly formulated in BG.III.10-14; the successive terms of the endless series being karmā (acts of the Sacrifice), yajña (the Sacrifice), parjanya (rain), bhūta (creatures), maṇḍa (food); and then again karmā, and so without end. In MULVI.37 the application is made to the interior Sacrifice; here the rain from above is the Chant (udgīthā) “whereby living beings here on earth live.”

Thus again we find that the performance of the Sacrifice is the basis of the
the Gods in the smoke of the Sacrifice is, of course, implied in the fact that Agni is the missal-priest (RV. VII. 10. 3 and passim); it is indeed in the same way that the spirit of the deceased, whose body is offered up on the funeral pyre, ascends thence.

It is, then, only when the Priest and the King, the human representatives of Sky and Earth, God and his Kingdom, are "united in the performance of the rite" (sacrata, etc.), only when "Thy will is done on Earth as it is in Heaven" (implying a mimesis of the Heavenly "forms," cf. AB. VI.27), that there is both a giving and a taking, a taking and a giving, not indeed an equality but a true reciprocity, Peace and prosperity, and fulness of life in every sense of the words, are the fruit of the "marriage" of the Temporal Power to the Spiritual Authority, just as they must be of the marriage of the "woman" to the "man" on whatever level of reference. For "Verily, when a mating is effected, then each achieves the other's desire" (CU.I.1.6); and in the case of the "divine mating" of the Sacerdotium and the Regnum, whether in the outer realm or within you, the desires of the two partners are for "good" here and hereafter. The needs of the soul and the body are to be satisfied together.

But, if the King cooperating with and assimilated to the higher power is thus the Father of his people, it is none the less true that satanic and deadly possibilities inheres in the Temporal Power: when the Regnum pursues its own devices, when the feminine half of the Administration asserts its independence, when Might presumes to rule without respect for Right, when the "woman" demands her "rights," then these lethal possibilities are realised; the King and the Kingdom, the family and the house, alike are destroyed and disorder (anreta) prevails. It was by an assertion of his independence and a claim to "equal rights" that Lucifer

(prosperity of the realm: it is from this point of view that in Mbh. (Vana Parva, XXV) Bhima addresses a king with the words, "Thy hand can rain gold." The source is inexhaustible; but the stream is not a stagnant one, only by the Sacrifice can it be kept in circulation.

The casorôdhá doctrine outlined above explains the iconography of the series of representations of the Cakravartin Emperor at Amarâvâti, of which I republished several in an article entitled "A Royal Gesture" in the Feestbundel v.d. K. Rotariensche Gesensteek van Kunst en Wetenschappen, Weltreden, Pt. 1, 1929; and republished here as Frontispiece. In these representations the Cakravartin, surrounded by his "Seven Treasures," is raising his right arm to the clouds, from which a shower of coins i.e. "wealth," bha) is falling. It is manifest that the Emperor's hand is the "ladle" of the Sacrifice, and that it is raised in accordance with BR VII.2.3.9 where the offering of bha) is fivefold; to agree with the five strata of the altar and "when he offers, he raises (the ladle) and so builds Agni up with his five strata."
(to be distinguished from the Lux, as the solar disc is distinguished from
the "Person in the Sun") fell headlong from Heaven and became Satan,"the Enemy": and by a like paranoia that Indra, "when maddened by
pride in his own heroic-power" (sva-virya darṣiptah) 80 became their
oppressor (devān bādhitum āreţhe), and could only be reawakened
(buddhāvā) from his stupor by the Spiritual-Power, by Saptagu-Bṛhaspati
(BD, VII. 54 f., RV. X. 47). We have also the case of King Soma, who
oppressed Bṛhaspati but was afterwards reconciled to him (SB. IV. 1.
2. 4), and that of Nahuṣa, who in the Epic replaces Indra for a time but
is ruined by his arrogance; cf. SB. V. 3. 1. 2 where if the King should
be "intoxicated" (ud vā ha mañyat) by his ritual exaltation, "let him
fall down headlong" (pra vā patet). A self-assertion on the part of the
Regnum is at the same time destructive and suicidal. 81

In a traditional society the oppressor is excommunicated and legally
deposed; this may be followed by a submission and apokatastasis, as in
Indra’s case and as foreseen in Islam for Iblis, or by the installation of
a more regular successor in whom the Kingship is reborn. In an anti-
traditional society, when the oppressor has been removed by a popular
revolution, those who have been oppressed propose to govern in their own
interests, and become oppressors in their turn. The majority oppresses
the minority. The rise of a plutocracy undermines what is still in name
a majority rule. The inefficiency and corruption of the plutocracy pre-
pared the way for the seizure of power by a single proletarian who becomes
a Dictator, or what is called in more technical terms a Tyrant, who no
longer pays even lip-service to any power above his own, and even if he
has “good intentions” is nevertheless “unprincipled.” This caricature
of monarchy in turn prepares the way for a state of disorder (asṛta)
such as may well be realised in the world in our own times. It is, indeed,

80 “Unlike Agni, the Sacerdotium, “not vain-gloryous because of his Counsel”
(kraśced ... apradṛṣiptah, RV. I. 145. 2).
81 “All political systems which directly contravene the law of nature and the
liberties of the spiritual power, are necessarily short-lived.” (George Avery,
SSM., in New English Weekly, July 25, 1940). “Division between Church and
Lay, that is what shall subsist now... Church shall be enslaved by State...
... by perfidy of all men the fruits of the earth shall perish, the mast of trees and the produce of the waters” (from the inter-
pretation of Derrnat’s dream, Standish H. O’Grady, Silva Gadelica, II, p. 84).
“Verily, so long as Indra knew not that Self, so long the Titans overcame
him... When he knew, then striking down and conquering the Titans, he com-
passed the chieftaincy, autonomous rule and overlordship of all Gods and all
beings” (Kaṭu. U. IV. 20). In Platonic terms, there can be no stability where
there is no agreement as to which shall rule, the better or the worse part. “Every
kingdom divided against itself is brought to a desolation” (Luke XI. 17).
already apparent that "what we call our civilisation is but a murderous machine with no conscience and no ideals" (G. La Piana in Harvard Divinity School Bulletin, XXXVII. 27). Such is the final consequence of the divorce of the Temporal Power from the Spiritual Authority, Might from Right, Action from Contemplation.

We have so far discussed only the cosmic (adhikēdevatam) and political (adhibāryam) aspects of the science of government and with reference to the individual as a subject. But this doctrine has also a self-referent (adhyātma) application; the question is not only one of a universal and a national or civic order, but also one of an internal economy. In the last analysis the man himself is the "City of God" (AV. X. 2. 30, BU. II. 5. 18) and it can as well be said of him as of any other city that "The city can never otherwise be happy unless it is drawn by those painters who copy a divine original" (Plato, Rep., 500 E, cf. KU. V. 1). Here also, then there must exist a government in which the factors of disorder must be ruled by a principle of order, if the goals of well-being in this world and the other are to be reached. That man has two selves is a universal doctrine; these are respectively natural and supernatural, the one outer and active, the subject of passions, the other inner, contemplative and serene. The problem of the internal economy by which the man's ends (purusārtha) can all be attained is one of the relationship of the psycho-physical Ego to the spiritual Person, the Outer King to the Priest within you: 42 for as Plato so often puts it, the welfare of "the entire soul and body" depends upon the unanimity of the mortal and immortal selves within you as to which shall rule. 43 That the Purohitā

42 Most Chinese philosophic schools have taught the way of what is called the 'Inner Sage and Outer King.' The Inner Sage is a person who has established virtue in himself; the Outer King is one who has accomplished great deeds in the world. The highest ideal for a man is at once to possess the virtue of a Sage and the accomplishment of a Ruler, and so become what is called a Sage-king, or what Plato would term the Philosopher-king" (Eung Yulian, History of Chinese Philosophy, translated by Derk Bodde, Peking, 1937, p. 2). The Inner Sage, the prejñatma, is the Emperor, or King of kings, the pātāja the Viceroy, and it is for the latter and active self to do what the former and contemplative self enjoins, not to "do as he likes."

43 Republic 432 C, etc. Plato's doctrine of the individual "city" is exactly paralleled in the Indian brahma pura ("City of God") contexts. For example, "(This body) with its eight 'circles' and nine apertures is Ayodhyā ('Unconquerable'), the City of the Gods, its golden treasury [heart] enfolded by the light of heaven, he who is a Comprehensor of that City of Brahma, by immortality enfolded, him Brahma and Brahman (Comm. Parmātman and Prajñapti) dower with life, renown and prosperity (AV. X. 2. 29-31)." "The Purū and Mathūrā is in every man, the kingdom of his own mind, where the personal self is to be put down... the Kama in each of us" (P. N. Sinha, A study of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 1901, p. 300). "One who has slain his Vytra" (TS. II. 5. 4. 5) has done this.
is the instigator and the King the agent, reflects the individual constitution in which the Inner Person is the kārṇyāti and the elemental self (the Outer Man) the kārty (MU. III. 3, Kaś. U. III. 8, BG. XVIII. 16).

These two selves of the man, who is dyātman (virtually at birth and actually by a rebirth), are respectively human, born of woman, and divine, born of the sacrificial fire (JR. I. 17, see JAOS 19, 2, p. 116; AB. III. 19 यजःद्वेष्यं देव्योग्यं प्रजायति, etc.). The two selves correspond

"The distinction of births in JB. I. 17 corresponds exactly to that of John III. 6 quod natura est carne, caro est; et quod natura est ex spiritu, spiritus est, and Gal. VI. 8 Qui seminat in carnis suo, de carne et morte corruptionem; qui autem seminat in spiritu, de spiritu metet vitam aeternam.

The "two selves" of the Sanskrit texts, Plato's "mortal and immortal parts of the soul," are the Inner and Outer Man, is qui foris est and is qui intus est of II Cor. IV. 16; of which St. Thomas Aquinas remarks In homine duo sunt (an echo of Plato's ἐν αὐτῷ ἀριθμὸς ἀρχῶν ἂν εἰμί, Republic 604 B), scilicet natura spiritualis et natura corporalis. Per hoc autem homo dicitur diligere seipsum, quod diligat se secundum naturam spirituallem (Sum. Theol., II-II. 26. 4, as in BU. IV. 5, etc.).

It is with reference to the corporal self or "life,"—the Buddhist "petty self," (appendeto) "which is not my (real) self," na me so ἄττα, passion—that Christ says Si quis vocit ad me, et non odit . . . suam animam, non potest meum discipulum esse (Luke XIV. 26), and with reference to their division (Plato's katharsis, the "separating of soul from body, so far as that is possible," Phædo 67 C) that St. Paul affirms that the Word of God (ον, all ἄρτη) extends to the sundering of soul from spirit (Heb. IV. 12). The distinction is that which is drawn by Philo (Quaestiones in Genesis, II. 59 and De Cherub. 113, as cited by Goddenough, By Light, Light, pp. 374, 375) between "us" and "that which was before our birth" and will be (cf. BG. II. 12) "when we, who in our junction with our bodies, are mixtures, shall not exist, but shall be brought into the rebirth," i.e. "born again" of the Divine Womb in the sense of JB. I. 17 and John III. 3.

The "two selves" are, again, the proprium and the suum (le moi and le soi) of St. Bernard. We "naturally" identify "ourselves" with the proprium, "our" individuality as known by "name and aspect" (sākṣa-śeṣa), "this man" to which we return from the sacrificial defilement thinking: "Now am I he who I really am." (śāhā yā evāśme śāhā, SB. I. 9. 3. 23), and to which the King returns with the same words at the end of the Rājasūya in which he had been made a Brāhmaṇ (AB. VII. 24); which comings back to one self are in the most technical sense of the word "desecrations." In thus returning we are forgetting that the proprium to which we return is not our real Self, not really an essence at all, but only a process. It is, on the other hand, with reference to our essence, St. Bernard's suum, that it is said "Thou art thon" (CU. VI. 8. 7 f.), and with reference to that Self, "the Overlord and King of all beings" (BU. II. 5. 15), that the Oracle enjoins, γενήσεσθαι. When Philosophy inquires of Boethius what he is, and he answers "a reasoning and mortal animal," she tells him that he has "forgotten" who he is and warns him: "If thou knowest not thyself, depart" (De consolatione, pres. vi and Conf. I. 8).

The injunction "Know thyself" is paralleled in the questions of the Brāhmaṇas
to (are the trace of) those of Mitāvarūpaḥ, Sacerdotium and Regnum (tāv ātmānaḥ, SB. IV. 1.4.1), and to the two natures of the Brahma, respectively mortal, concrete and vocal, and immortal, discrete and silent, etc. (BU. II. 3.1, MU. VI. 3.15, 22, 36), whereby he is deśīthāṅka ("of one essence and two natures") (MU. VII. 11, 8). That the inner and the outer man are the trace of the two natures, Sacerdotal and Royal, in dicih is can be shown as follows: it is as the Truth or Reality (satya) and as Untruth or Unreality (anṛta) that Brahma enters into these worlds nominally (nāmā) and phenomenally (rūpaṇa, SB. XI. 2.3.3-6),24 in other words both as Affirmation (omā) and as Negation (na, AA.

and Upāniṣads, "Which self?" (kutaraḥ sa ātma, AA. II. 6; kutamaḥ ātma, BU. IV. 3.7, MU. II. 1; and similarly kena'atma, Sn. 308) and "In whom, when I go forth hence, shall I be going forth?" (kasmīn... utkriṣṭa bhavīṣyati, Praśna U. VI.3) with the answer in CU. III. 14.4 "in Brahma." The true answer to the question "Who art thou?" (kas tasm esa), viz., "What thou art, that light am I" (ko 'ham aham evam tasm), is the password that opens the gates of the Kingdom of Heaven and wins the welcome "Come in, O myself" (JUB. III. 14. 1-5; Kaus, U. I. 5-6; Rūmī, Mathnawi, I. 3062 f.). Incidentally, I am convinced that the Delphic γεωργίας and E are a question (signum) and an answer (responsum) asked and given at the door (certainly a "Sundoor") of Apollo’s shrine; "Know thyself" implying "Who art thou," and E = El meaning (1) Apollo and (2) "thou art" (these are two of Plutarch’s interpretations, Moretia 392 A), the answer to the question "Who art thou?" (seeking admittance) taking the form "The Sun thou art" (that am I). "That thou art, thus may I be," he says in effect... Verily, he invokes this blessing" (TS. I. 5.7.6). Cf. my "The 'E' at Delphi" in Review of Religion, Nov. 1941.

24 Hence in order to reach their source "Both that truth and that untruth are to be penetrated" (tad etat satyam, tad anṛtam vedhāhyam, Mungel. U. II. 2.2). The world of pairs of opposites, affirmations and negations, good and evil, is a theophany. It has not been said that "the invisible things of him" (Rom. I. 29) are only to be known by those of the things that were made that seem to us "good"; the obvious answer to the question "Did he who made the lamb make thee?" is affirmative. The problem of evil ("Can a good God have permitted this?", cf. JUB. I. 18. 2) can only be posed by a monophysite or a dualist. The Muslim sees in Heaven and Hell the "reflections" of the divine Mercy (Sacerdotium) and divine Majesty (Regnum). In That One (tad ekam, ekam anviktam, cāevam ekam, adevaktam, ekatevam) Mitra and Varuna, male and female, lamb and lion "lie down together." To blame Him for the existence of any one of these pairs is to blame him for that of the other, because each presupposes the other, to blame him for making a world at all, for a world-picture can only be painted in chiaroscuro, not all in white or all in black. Yet it is our ends that the world of good and evil serves, for without it there would be no way of procedure from potentiality to act. It is not the First Cause, but our knowledge of good and evil that is the occasion of our mortality. This First Cause, which we cannot call either good or evil in any human sense, is the cause of our existence, but we ourselves the cause of our manner of being.
II. 3. 6); the distinction of satya from anrita is that of the Devas from the Asuras (SB. III. 9. 4. 1, cf. IX. 5. 1. 12), that of om from ma is that of the Devas from others, whether men or Asuras (AB. I. 16 and II. 2), as, for example in RV. I. 164. 19, cf. BG. II. 61 and Sn. 724 f.; the distinction of satyam from anritam is also precisely that of the temporarily superhuman (deified) and priestly person of the initiated Sacrificer from the secular So-and-so to which he returns when the sacred operation is relinquished (SB. I. 9. 3. 23 with VS. I. 5 and II. 28, cf. AB. VII. 24 where the King is similarly desecrated at the conclusion of the rite where he calls upon the Trinity to witness that now once more “I am who I am”); and this is the distinction between the two selves of the Sacrificer, one the natural man and the other the second and divine Self to which he is sacrificially reborn (JB. I. 17, AB. III. 19, etc.); while finally, just as it is by a marriage of Mitra and Varuna, the Deva and the Asura, brahma and kṣatra, that the Kingdom is maintained, so it is by a marriage of Truth (satya) to Untruth (anrita) that man himself is propagated and increased (tayor mithunat praṇajyate bhūyān bhavati, AA. II. 3. 6). That the relationship is thought of as that of Outer King and Inner Sage is also clear from the actual wording of the texts; e.g. RV. X. 21. 2 where “one should speak according to one’s own Counsel, and by the Intellect handle the more glorious Power” (svēna krātunā sām vadeta śrēyānamsa dāksam mēnasā jagṛbhyāt), and it is obvious that kratu and manas are the interior brahma and the savāvadana and dāksa the external kṣatra (we

It does not follow that the distinction of good from evil and truth from falsehood lacks validity here and now, as though both could be called good. The way to the Unity of Brahma leads from the Darkness, Untruth, and Death to the Light, Reality, and Life (BU. I. 3. 8); it was by following this “Ancient Path” (RV. IV. 18. 1, BU. IV. 4. 8, S. II. 106, IV. 117, etc.) that the Devas separated themselves from the Asuras and became what they are (SB. IX. 5. 1. 12), “by qualification” (arhaṇā) that they (who with exception of Agni were originally mortal) became Immortals (RV. X. 63. 4), assimilated to him “whose name is Truth” (CU. VIII. 3. 4, I John V. 20, etc.). By this via affirmativa one rises higher and higher in the hierarchy of degrees of reality or truth (MU. IV. 6) until we reach the Sun, who is the Truth absolutely (JUB. I. 5. 3 and passim) but through whom the Way leads on to Brahma; to reach that Unity, the ultimate reality that was “hidden by the Truth” (BU. I. 6. 3), we must deny the names that have been given to God, to know him only as unknown (MU. IV. 6). In other words, the end of the road (adhevaḥ pārem) and summit of contingent being (bhavāgra) bring us to a wall through which the only way is by the strait gate of the Sun door, that bare the way to anyone who still is anyone. What lies beyond is “other than Law or lack of Law, other than our well or ill-done, other than past or future” (anyatra dharmād anyatradharmād anyatrasaṁkṣipta kṛtadhyāt anyatra bhūtān ca bhavyate ca, KU. II. 14); there, as Eckhart expresses it, “neither vice nor virtue ever entered in” to Him who is “neither good nor true.”
say "handle" to suggest "handfasting," because the wording could also be applied to the "taking" or "marriage" of kārtu to vāc, manus to daksā, contemplation to action), and CU. VII. 25. 2 where the application of the political terms svarāj and angyarāj is to the man himself.

Of the two selves, one is the psycho-physical individuality (bhūtātman, śārira ātman, dehika ātman, jīvātman, etc.), this man So-and-so, the other the spiritual Person (paramātman, prajñātman, jñānātman, āsārīra ātman, svarabhūtānām ātman, vaisvānara ātman, ātmā sārvāntarāk, anlārātman, mahātman, etc.), the solar Ātman of RV. I. 115. 1 and related texts, the pneumatic Daimon (ātmanavat yakṣa) of AV. X. 2. 32 and 8. 43, the "contemplative, uninveterated, ever-youthful Spirit, knowing whom none is afraid of Death" of AV. X. 8. 44: in Buddhism, the one the Great or Fair (mahāttā, kalyāṇattā), the other the petty or foul self (appatūma, pāpattā), A. I. 149, 249. The former is "this self," the latter "that," "yonder," or "the other" self (AA. II. 3. 7, ayam ātmā . . . asāv ātmā; ib. II. 5 itara ātmā; SB. I. 8. 3. 17 and 19 itara ātmā, and ṭb. IV. 3. 4. 5 anyām ātmānam; D. I. 34 añño atī). That "Self of (this mortal) self (ātmano 'tmā) is called its Immortal Guide" (netā amṛtaḥ, MU. VI. 7, cf. RV. V. 50. 1); this self is possible, "its immortal Self (amṛta syā 'tmā) as is the drop of water on the lotus leaf" (MU. III. 2), i.e. unattached, imperturbable.

"That art thou" (tat tevam asi, CU. VI. 8. 6, etc.). In other words, this outer, active, feminine and mortal self of ours subsists more eminently in and as that inner, contemplative, masculine and immortal self of ours, to which it can and should be "reduced," i.e. "led back" or "wedded" (niṣṭa, upaniṣṭa). Our existence (esse, Werden) is contingent, our consciousness of essence (essentia, Wesen) is valid and indefeasible, ex

**See note 34. Just as in Christianity, all creation is feminine to God, and in the same way the body feminine to the Spirit. All birth depends upon the conjuration (sāmyoga) of the "Knower of the Field" with the "Field." (BG. XIII.) as a wife to a husband, so is the body (taṇḍu), which is for the sake of good works (saṁkṛtya kām), to the Spirit (ātman, TS. I. 10, 1-2); the Sun is our real Father (JUB. III. 10. 4, etc.). All this must be taken for granted if the theory of government is to be understood.

It may be added that there is nothing so strange about the relation of Krṣṇa to the gopi, his bhaktas, as is often supposed: Peter Sterry, for example, writes "The Lord Jesus hath his Concubines, his Queenes, his Virgines; Saints in Remoter Formes, Saints in higher Formes, Saints unmarried to any Forme, who keep themselves single for the immediate Imbraces of their Love" (V. de S. Pinto, Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan, p. 25). It should be noted that these are the words of a Puritan divine.

Irenæus (I. 13. 3) quotes the gnostic Markos, "Prepare thyself as a bride to receive a bridegroom, that thou mayest be what I am and I what thou art."
tempore. But our awareness of our own essence is obscured by our conviction (abhībhumāna as in MU. III.2) of being essentially, and not merely accidentally, "this man." So-and-so, our fond belief "that I am the doer" (BG. etc., passim). That other, Inner Man, the Self "that has never become anyone" (KU. II. 18. cf. Hermes, Asclepius II.14, Deus ... nec nesci potest, nec potuit), meanwhile remains unknown and incredible to us so long as this outer man asserts its independence, so long as "thou knowest not thyself" (Cant. i. 8. si ignoras te): the stupified bhūtātman "fails to see the generous author of existence (bhagavan prabhun — mahātmanam), the (real) cause of actions (kāreyātāram, cf. JUB. I. 6. 2, BU. I. 6. 3, John VIII. 28, etc.), within himself" (ātmastham, MU. III. 3, cf. BG. XVIII. 16). Thus to have forgotten what one is, "know oneself" only as a "reasoning and mortal animal" (Bec- thius, De Consol., pros VI) is the greatest of all privations. The distinction is sharply drawn in Kaṇ, U. IV. 20 (cf. CU. VIII. 7.1) where "so long as Indra knew not this spiritual-Self (ātmān), so long the Asuras (the extroverted powers of the soul, cf. Śaṅkara on BU. I. 3. 1) overcame him... When he knew it, then striking down and conquering the Asuras, he compassed the chieftaincy, autocracy and overlordship of all Gods and all beings, as may he likewise do who is a Comprehensor thereof."67

To "want" and to "will" are incompatible; the one implies a privation, the other implies an abundance: "the Spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Math. XXVI. 41); so that, as Rūmī says, "Whoso hath not surrendered will (self-will), no Will (free will) hath he" (Ode XIII in Nicholson, Shams-i-Tabriz). The mirage of an individual "liberty" is the direct antithesis of the dogmatic summum bonum, which "highest good" is indeed a liberty, but a liberty from oneself, not of oneself (the So-and-so), the freedom of those who can say with the Comprehensor "I do nothing" (BG. V. 8), with Christ that "I do nothing of myself" (John VIII.28), with the Buddha that "I wander in the world, a veritable Nemo" (Sn. 455-6) and are "free as the Godhead in its non-existence" (Eckhart); "Were it not for the shackle, who would say 'I am I'?" (Rūmī, Mathnavī, I. 2449).

To "do as one likes" is by no means synonymous with "liberty," but much rather a subjection to the "ruling passions" (indriyāṇi) that one calls "one's own."68 Those who are dominated by their own inclinations

---

67 The passage is pertinent both to the story of Indra's enlightenment (CU. VIII.7-11) and to that of his fall and apokatastasis (BD.VII.54 f.).

68 Plato recognizes two kinds or parts of the "soul" in us, or two lives or selves, mortal and immortal; with one or the other of these we identify "ourselves." The man governed by his desires is ἐρως ἑαυτῷ, "subject to himself,"
are “free men only in name” (Plato, Republic, 431c). We are much more the creatures of our thoughts than their author. The man who does not know, “thinks” what he likes to think. Where we ought to like what we know, we actually “know what we like”; which is to say that liking and disliking are our masters, rather than our servants. There is accordingly no greater lesson to be learnt than not to think for oneself, but by the Self, atmanas (CU. VII. 26. 1) = kara logos.

What, then, is meant by “autonomy”? In the case of a King, to rule and not be ruled by the multitude of those who should be vassals and subjects; at home, to rule and not be ruled by one’s family; and within you, to rule and not be ruled by one’s desires. “He whose pleasure is in the (spiritual) Self, whose love-sports are with the Self, he whose bridegroom is the Self, and whose bliss is in the Self (atmaraśīrūta-kriḍā 

ātmamithuna 

ātmānandādah) becomes autonomous (svāraj) and a mover-of-will (kāmaśāśra) in every world; but those whose knowledge is heterogeneous become heterogeneous (anyatā), and do not become movers-at-will in any world” (CU. VII. 25. 2); **for “Here on earth the children of men dwell in subjection to command, since whatever it be that they desire, whether a kingdom or field (i.e. whether it be a King or any other man), it is on that very thing that they base their life” (CU. VIII. 1, 5),** and “Why then,” as St. Augustine exclaims, “should miserable

i.e. to the self that says “I want”; one who governs his desires is svārita 

śauvra, i.e. “master of himself,” i.e. the self that says “I want” (Laws 645, Republic 431, etc.). In the first case he (the subject predicated by ṣūra and ṣvārita) identifies “himself” with the ṣvārita 

śauvra (ḥūtātman), “overcome” by likes and dislikes (MU. III. 2), and in the second case with the imperturbable ṣvārita 

śauvra (prajātāman). The former condition is one of “ignorance,” the latter one of “wisdom” (Protagoras 358). The welfare of the “whole soul” depends upon the harmony of its parts and their “unanimity as to which shall rule” (Republic 432 C). All this is the same for the State and in the individual economy.

**Ca. Mund. U. III. 1. 4. The language is equally applicable to the political economy of Regnum and Sacerdotium, and to the individual economy of the “two selves,” Outer King and Inner Sage.**

For the kāmaśāśra cf. RV. IX. 113. 9; JUB. III. 28. 3; CU. VIII. 5. 4; Taitt. U. III. 5; D. I. 172; John X. 9; and HJAS. IV. 1929, p. 35.

As it is primarily the Gale of the Spirit that “moveth as it will” (yathānāśām, RV. X. 168. 4; smīte vīm yathā kāśma, J. V. 418; John III. 8), so it is only one “gone with the wind” (Kaus U. II. 12, etc.) in the sense of the the requiem gobhata vātām ātmā (RV. X. 16. 3) that can be called “free”; or to use the language of NT., only those who are “in the spirit” (συγεπαρ) that can “pass in and out.”

**Similarly the Buddhist D. I. 172, forming part of the instruction of a King in the “Advantages of the Monastic Life”: the servant of desire is his own**
men venture to pride themselves on their freewill before they are set free? ... For by whom a man is overcome, to him he is assigned in slavery " (De spir. et lit., 52, cf. MU. II. 1-2). When this mystical union (ātmamihumah) of the inner and the outer man has been consummated, when the two fires that hated one another (TS. V. 2. 4. 1-2) have been made one (ekam bhavanti), in this affectionate, unanimous, and cooperative marriage, then it can be said that "This self offers itself (ātmānam samprayacchait)" to that Self, and that Self to this self. They unite with one another (tāv anyonyam abhisambhavataḥ). By this (earthly, feminine) form, he (the aforesaid Comprehensor of Indra as Overlord) unites with yonder world (anesāha rūpenāmum lokam abhisambhavati) and by that form with this world." (AA. II. 3. 7); thus both worlds are gained for both selves, this world without and that other within you. We say "within you" here, because it is at "World's end" that Sky and Earth embrace (samābhikatā, JUB. I. 5. 5); that World's end, beyond which there is no more grieving, is at the core of our own being, and that is the Wayfarer's goal.

On the other hand, we are naturally at war with ourselves, and often not merely at war with "what is divine in us," but ignorant of it because of our "notion that 'I' am the doer" (ahānikāra), and so effectively slave, not his own master nor able to go where he will (sa yeva kāmaṁ gamo = na kāmdeśaṁ), while the man "the doors of whose senses are guarded (indriyeu gutta-deva = atta-gutto, Dh. 379) is his own master, freed from his slavery (dāsaye mumto) and able to go where he will."

In almost identical language, Plato describes those who are "subject to themselves" (see note 58) as "freemen only in name" (Republic 431 C). He tells us also regarding the education of Persian princes, that they had four tutors, respectively most wise, most just, most temperate, and most brave. The first taught him the Magian lore of Zoroaster, the second always to be truthful, the fourth to be fearless, and the third "not to be mastered even by a single pleasure, in order that he may acquire the habit of being a free and real King, one who is first of all the ruler of whatever powers are in himself, and not their slave" (Alcibiades I. 122). We can readily believe that the Persian and Indian conceptions of Kingship were indeed alike.

The "free-will" that Christian doctrine asserts for all is evidently not the "self-will," but rather a freedom to resist or consent to the higher will, that of the spirit ("the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak," Math, XXVI. 41). To do our own will is to be passive; to cooperate with the spirit is to be in act. Cf. note 44.

That the natural man is an automaton is admirably demonstrated in S. III. 66-67 (see HJAS IV, 1939, p. 135).

sāmpanyat, to "profer," correlative of ṣr, to "woo."

I.e. purna ḍojarī... svadā rūpeya abhinipadyate (CU. VIII. 12. 3).

“one-selled” (ekatman) and “Selfless” (anatman), although potentially possessed of both natures (dvyatman), this born of the flesh and that born of the spirit. Our house is divided against itself. In this state of disorder “Man’s self (the Tyrant) has no other foe than the Self (the legitimate King); that Self is a friend to the self that hath of itself vanished itself, but a foe at war with one who lacks the Self” (anatmanah... satyavat, BG. VI. 5. 6). Such a privation of Self, and corresponding mortality, was the original condition of both the Gods and Titans: Devas and Asuras were in the beginning equally anatman, and only Agni amrta (SB. II. 2. 2. 8, cf. XI. 1. 2. 12 and XI. 2. 3. 6), and “As are men now (i.e. Self-less and mortal), so were the Gods in the beginning” (TS. VII. 4. 2. 1). The Gods, however, “desired: ‘Let us do away with the privation (svartim), the evil (papmanam), death (mrtiyum)’” (TS. VII. 4. 2. 1), “They longed for the world of heavenly-light” (JUB. I. 15. 1), the Sun himself “desired: ‘Let me, indeed, cut off all the evil, so that I may ascend to the world of heavenly light’; he saw the sacrifice, grasped it and sacrificed therewith; thus he cut off all the evil and ascended to the world of heavenly light, and he, it is that having put off the evil, now shines” (JR. II. 83): it was, in fact, only “by qualification” (arhadva), “by Agni’s counsels” (krtubhik), by the Sacerdotium (bratman) that the Gods attained their immortality (RV. X. 63. 4, VI. 7. 4, SB. XI. 2. 3. 6). And as did the Sun, so may now the man who is a Comprehensor of the sacrifice, cut off all evil and rise above himself (JR. II. 83): it is only in finding him-Self that a man is beatified, for “All that is other than the Interior Self of All, other than thy Self, is an affliction” (esata aimd sarvantar to anyad artam, BU. III. 4. 2).

The answer, then, to the question “Who is worthy (arhati) to enter into union with that Sun?” (JUB. I. 6. 1), i.e. “to break out of the universe,” is that he is able, he is an arhati, who can answer to the question “Who art thou?” “I am myself” (JUB. III. 1. 6, Kaus. Up. I. 2, etc.) : it is to him that the welcome is addressed, “Come in, O myself” (Rum, Mathnawi, I. 3063). But if he has not verified the words “That art thou,” if he does not know who he is, but speaks of himself by his own or a family name, he is driven or dragged away from the Door and excluded from the Marriage (JUB. III. 14. 2 = JB. I. 18, Rum I. 3057, Cant. I. 8, Math. VII. 21, 23, XXV. 10, Rev. XIX. 9, etc.). “Woe unto him who departs from this world, not having known that Imperishable” (BU. III. 8. 10).

**The whole of this symbolism recurs in Plato (Phaedrus 246, 247, etc.) and Hermes Trismegistus (I. 11.f., etc.).**
Thus the first and last of all man’s needs is to “know himself” (ut \textit{sciat seipsum}, Avecebrol, \textit{Fons Vitae}, I.2): the “science of the Self” (\textit{ātmavidyā}) is the final term of all doctrine (CU. IV. 14. 1, Švet. Up. I.16, etc.). The ancient and timeless oracle, “Know thyself” (γνῶθι \textit{seautōν}), resounds throughout the Philosophia Perennis. The doctrine of the Self is thus appropriately introduced by such questions as: “Which is the Self?” (\textit{katarah sa ātmā}, AA. II.6, \textit{kamatā ātmā}, BU. IV.3.7, MU. II.1), “Who is our ‘Self,’ what is ‘Brahma’?” (\textit{ko na ātmā, kim brahma}, CU. V.11.1), and “In whom, when I go forth hence, shall I be going forth?” (\textit{kasmīna aham utkrānta utkrānta bhavīṣyami}, Praśna U. VI.3), i.e. When I “give up the ghost” (Sanctus Spiritus), shall I be in that immortal Spirit, or, in the words of Blake, “ seized and giv’n into the hands of my own selfhood?” What the answer to this last question shall be depends upon the degree of our Self-knowledge now: “Whoever departs from this world without having found the Spirit, there is no freedom for him” (CU. VIII.1.6), but “The Comprehensor of the common Person of all, the Comprehensor of the logos ‘That is my Self,’ he when he goes forth falls in with the incorporeal Self, and leaves behind him the other and corporeal self” (\textit{sarveśam bhūtānām ātaraṁ puruṣaḥ sa na ātmeti, vidyāt sa utkrānam evaśatam asarvānam prajñātmaṁ abhisampadyate vijñātalāram daśikām, ŚA. VIII.7): “there can be no doubting for him who is assured of this, that ‘This Self of mine in the heart, is Brahman; coessential with him am I (\textit{tam... abhisambhavītāmi}) when I go forth hence’” (CU. III.14.4); “Who knoweth Him, knoweth himself, and is not afraid to die” (AV. X.8.44). Thus the dust returns to earth and the spirit to him who gave it (Eccl. XII.7). We need only add that these doctrines of man’s two selves and of their composure (\textit{samādi, samādhi}) are as much Buddhist as Brahmanical, and as much Platonic and Christian as either of these.

The “composure” of the yogīn in whom the habit of \textit{samādhi} persists is in fact the same as his “self-possession,” the possession of and by one’s Self in that deathlike “sleep” that is the entelechy of the beatific conjunction of the conjoint principles, Indra and Indrāni, described in SB. X.5.2.11-17 in explanation of the notions “one and many, far and near”; “So let the Comprehensor ‘sleep’ (lāsmād evam eṣa sāyappāt): He who with love leadeth forth (prāñjapati, cf. MU. VI.7 \textit{khalv ātmamo ‘tam netā amṛtākhyāḥ: \textit{v야}, “to lead, control, marry”) all his children, He is verily the Breath (prāṇāḥ, i.e. Ātman, Vāyu, Prajñāpāti, Sūrya, Agni, Brahma, and here in particular Mrtyu) and these breaths or lives (prāṇāḥ, i.e. sense-powers) are his own ‘subiects’ (sādā, cf. VS. XII.82, BU. IV. 4. 37, etc.), and when one sleeps (srāpiṣṭi), then these breaths,
his subjects, go in unto him (enam ... apiganti, cf. JUB. I. 15. 8 prāṇam apyeti ... sarvam prāṇam abhisammatt) ; this 'sleep' (svapna) is verily 'coming into one's own' (svāpna = svā-apī-aṇa, cf. CU. VI. 7. 8 svam apīla), as it is expressed metaphysically (ity ācakṣate parāksam). . . . Thus it is that He is not merely 'One' (ekāh) but also *Several' (*ekāh)—as what is one in the whole, and many in its parts . . . absolutely, and many accidentally" (St. Thomas Aquinas, Sum. Theol., I. 11. 1 ad 2)—and thus both ākala and kala (MU. VI. 15). Now just as in English "coming into" is "taking possession of," so here there is play on the words āpi (āpi-i) "to go in unto" and āp "to take possession of," suggested by the likeness of svāpnyā to svāpi (whether su-āpi = "loyal intimate or ally," or svā-āpi, "own intimate or ally") in AB. III. 16 "the Maruts, those good allies, are the breaths" (prāṇā vai marutaḥ svāpnyāḥ), Indra's allies in the battle with Vṛtra when all other Gods desert him (ib. and III. 16) ; and by such expressions as āptakāma (BU. IV. 3. 21, cf. CU. I. 1. 6), kāmasāpti (KU. II. 11), sarvāpti (Kaus. U. III. 3), and te brāhmaṇapuḥ āthāmātā āsuh (SB. XI. 2. 3. 6). This relationship of the loyal breaths to the Breath, their first principle, can also be stated as that of the sensitive selves (the "seeing man," cakṣusapurusa, CU. VIII. 12. 4, the "hearing man," etc.; collectively the man himself—prāṇa u ha vàva, vàjan, manvasyāna sambhātiḥ, JUB. IV. 7. 4, aksara-sammānaḥ caksurmayāḥ śrotamayaḥ chandomaya manomaya vāṁmaya ātmā, AA. III. 2. 2; cf. Hermes, Lib. XI. 2. 12a) to the central Self, as in Kaus. U. IV. 20 where on the one hand the foreknowing-Self (prajñātman) enters into the body, and on the other these (sensitive) selves depend on that Self as retainers on their chieftain (tam etam ātmānam ete ātmano nānavasyanti yathā śreṣṭhānām svāh). he for them and they for him, "For thou art ours, and we are thine" (RV. VIII. 92. 32).**

It is when a man is "asleep" in the sense intended above, and more briefly in CU. VI. 8. 1, where "what is called 'being asleep' is really 'coming into one's own'" (svapitāty ācakṣata svām āpi apī bhavati), and it is clear that svapna as a technical term really means the mastery of the senses and effectively śhyāna, as also in BU. II. 1. 17 where (just as in Hermes Trismegistus, Lib. I. 1) "a man is said to be 'asleep' when he curbs the senses" (as horses are curbed)," and only when he

**Plato, "God is our guardian, and we are his possessions" (Phaedo, 69 D).

"An identical interpretation of "sleep" will be found in Hermes Trismegistus, Lib. I. 1. The Outer Man, whom we think of as "awake" is really asleep and dreaming; the Inner and contemplative Man whom we think of as "asleep" when we fail to understand the metaphysical "inaction" is really awake and in act, in the sense that the Buddha is literally the "Wake," and the analogous (paramārthika) sense in which Agui is "wakened at daybreak" (usur-buddha).
is thus "asleep," that he is really empowered and really free. "When he 'sleeps' these worlds are his, then he becomes as a great King or a great Brāhman; likewise he attains to the high and the low. Even as a great King, taking with him his people, so also ‘this man,' reining in his senses, drives about in (the chariot of) his own body at will" (BU. II.1.18). The only royal road to power is to become one's own master; the mastery of whatever else follows. This is the traditional "secret of government," Chinese and Platonic as much as it is Indian.

The whole point of the injunction "Let the Comprehensor sleep" (tānmar evanvit svapyaḥ) in SB. X. 5.2.12 will be lost if we think it is opposed to the "Let him fight" (tasmad yuddhyaśva) or "Act" (karlum arkaś) of BG. II. 18 and III. 21. These are no longer conflicting, but coincident imperatives for what is now the mitra persona of Krishna rather than the single and hesitant person of Arjuna only. The "sleep" intended is the having the sense powers in hand and under one's control and thus really possessed (as is explicit in BU. II. 1.17), and this is the "autonomy" of the King who is free to move-at-will in his own realm (ib. 18); while the "action" intended is the activity of one whose actions are not reactions to pleasure and pain but only such as are "correct." To combine and paraphrase BG. II. 69 and IV. 18, "He who sees inaction in action, and action in action, sleep in waking and waking in sleep, he is wise, he is awake, he is all in all." "Yoga is skill in works" (karmasu kausalam, BG. II. 50,—it will be recalled that the original value of oso, "wise," is precisely that of kuśala, "expert"); the kingly art is precisely karma yoga, "and it need but little of this lore to save from the great fear" (BG. II. 40). The dharana, dhyāna, samādhi of yoga (Christian consideratio, contemplatio, and excessus or captus) are so many degrees of self-possession, consummated in a going out of or being emptied of oneself and a finding of one's real Self, which is also the "Self" of the immanent Spirit: "When the rider in the (psycho-physical) vehicle is liberated from all these things with which he has been stuffed (paripūrṇa) and by which (sense perceptions) he has been overcome, then indeed he proceeds to union with himSelf" (ātman eva sānyujam upaiti, MU. IV. 4; cf. Plato, Phaedo 66 C, 67 A). We are thus brought back to the deepest values of "self-possession": "When thou art rid of self, then art thou self-controlled (dīnes selbes gewaltig = svartjan, ḫspar[t] ḫaro[v], and self-controlled art self-possessed (dīnes selbes egn), and self-possessed possessed of God (ist got din egn) and all that he has ever made" (Eckhart, Pfeiffer, p. 538), a passage that reads like a literal translation from an Upanisad: prasannatmātmāni sthitvā, sukham avyayam oknute, MU. VI. 20! By the same token a deeper sense emerges in the expression
"All alone by himself"; in the conflict with Death, in which the issue is literally one of "victory or death," we are "all alone"; but "by oneself," that means side by side with our very Self, Ātmanasvahadhāya (Manu, VI.49), the "Inseparable Companion" of BU. II.1.11 and Kaś. U. IV.12.

There remains then to be effected in Everyman, who is still a kingdom or house divided against itself, such a marriage of selves as we have spoken of, and as in CU. VII.25 and AA. II.3.7. We have already alluded to the consummation of this divine marriage (dāiram mitthunam, ἡς γαίρος) described in SB.X.5.3.11-16 as the beatific union of Indra and Indrāṇī, "the Persons in the right and left eyes."** These two are respectively the King and Queen on the right and on the left; what we have elsewhere called the Inner Sage and Outer King are here, then, thought of in accordance with the functional symbolism with which we are now familiar, the King and the Queen; they represent in fact the brahma and kṣatra, and just as we saw in SB.IV.1.4.1f. that the success of whatever is undertaken by either depends upon a marital consent of wills—a special case of the general principle enunciated in CU.1.1.6-8—so here the union of Indra with Indrāṇī "makes them successful" (samarthayati). The holy marriage, the synthesis (sāṃbhā) of the conjoint principles, immortal and mortal "selves" implied in CU. VII.25, 2, is even more poignantly described in BU.IV.3.21: "That is his hypermetrical form,*** from which all evil has been struck away, free of all fear. As a man embraced by a darling bride (priyāyā strīyā sam-

** For the "person in the (right) eye" see BU.IV.2.2,3 and IV.4.1, CU.I.7.5, MU.VII.1.1-3. This image seen in the pupil of the eye is the form of our real being and that of the "Person in the Sun" who is called variously Death, Breath, and usually Indra; the "Person in the Sun" being "Indra, Prajāpati, Brahma" (Sacerdotium) (KR.VIII.3). In SB.III.1.3.15 it is Śuṣṇa that becomes the pupil of the eye.

The symbolism of the "person seen in the eye" is probably ancient. Plato (Ateiresis I.132) uses it in a slightly different way, but for him also it is a form analogous to what in us is most like God.

*** Atticchaundā, usually interpreted to mean "beyond desires," but really with more direct reference to the chandāsī, which are the means of our metrical reintegration and the wings on which the Spirit ascends to the Sun (AV.VIII.9.2, AB.VII.27, etc.). "Yonder Sun is the Disposer; and it is inasmuch as he hath gone unto the uttermost of the Quarters that there he stands and gleams... The Metres are the Quarters" (dīśo hy etā chāndāsī, SB.IX.5.1.37, 39). Atticchaundā (for atticchaundā) in BU.IV.3.21 is, according to Śaṅkarā, "beyond desires"; but I think that the reference is to the "whole and completed" form, like that of the Fire-altar, atticchaundā in SB.X.5.3.8, where the meaning of the word is certainly "hypermetrical" or "super-metrical."
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pâriñvaktah) is conscious neither of a within or without, so this man embraced by the foreknowing-spiritual-Self (prajñānātmāna) knows naught of a within or a without; that is verily his (real) form, in which he is possessed of his desires, the Spirit being his desire, so that he is undesirous (ātmakāmam, āptakāmam akāmām) and is excepted from sorrow." This is manifestly a return to the primordial state of the Spiritual Person (ātman, purusa) "as it were that of a man and a woman embraced" (yathā stripramāṇam sampāriñvaktu, BU.I.4.4): "In dem unbegrannen der höhen einekeit, diu alle dinge vernichtet in ir selbeshet-sunder sich, ist sind ein äne underscheit. . . . Ein und ein vereinet dā liuhet blōz in blōz. . . . Also wirt diu sēle got in gote" (Eckhart, Pfeiffer, pp. 517, 531). The man is no longer this man So-and-so, but dissolved in himSelf. The outer man has been "crowned and mitred above himself" (Dante, Purgatorio XXVII.182). It is precisely such a crowning and mitering that is ritually enacted in the Rājasīyā: the King's "divinity" is not "his own," not "this man's" who sits upon the throne, but that of the principle that overrules him and of which he is, not the reality, but the living image, instrument and puppet. In this experience, the Outer King is merged in the life and being of the Inner Sage, this man in the real Self, geworden was er ist: the words "That art thou" have been verified; the longing, "What thou art, that may I be" has been satisfied.

Like the King's attainment of Brahmanhood (AB.VII.23) and like all the sacrificial Himmelfahrten this is, of course, an experience inevitably followed by a return to oneself, the man So-and-so. But like any other marriage, the nuptial coronation rite marks the beginning of a new order, it is a new man that ascends the throne: an outer man in operation, but now the legitimate agent of a higher than his own will. As the individual is assimilated to the Self, the woman to the man, so is the Regnum to the Sacercultum: the consorts are unanimous, so that what the one enjoins the other performs. The individual is no longer enslaved by his own desires, but has found an infallible guide and mentor in the person of the Daimon or Indwelling Spirit (ātmanvat yakṣa, anlārtāman), Hegemon (antaryāmin, nētṛ), Synteresis as Shepherd and Guardian (rāstragopā, gopī, ārakkha devatā) and "correction du

*On the Synteresis (essentially the same as Plato's immanent ἱέγει, ἱάμας, and λέγει, and/or "con-science" but with far more than the merely moral values that this latter word now implies for us) see O. Rem, Die Synteresis nach dem hl. Thomas von Aquin, Münster, 1911. "Synteresis" is etymologically Skt. semitrāka (śīṛt), "one who enables another to cross over" (to the farther shore), and so "savior" or "deliverer."
savoir-faire” (pramâna); “the Inner Sage who may be called the Chap-
lain” within you, and to whom the Purohita, who is the Chaplain of the
King’s house, corresponds in the civil realm. The artist is no longer
“expressing himself,” but can say with Dante that “I take note, and
even as He dictates within me, I set it forth” (Purgatorio XXIV, 52).
The married woman is no longer at large, but now in charge of a kingdom,
that of her household. And all of these agreements are analogous to the
agreement of an Emperor who makes a treaty of peace with a rebellious
vassal or would-be independent ruler who, in accordance with customary
Indian policy, explicit in the Arthaśāstra, is now restored to his throne
and empowered to govern, but now as the Emperor’s friend. It is the
same for the Inner and Outer Man.

There is now a state of peace, where there had been one of anxiety.
The composure (samādhi) of the outer rebel and inner leader enables
the whole man to rise above the battle even while participating in it. The
King is now in reality a “Highness”; his actions are no longer deter-
mined by the likes and dislikes of his sensitive part (necessitas comotionis);
but inwardly instigated, and being thus strictly speaking “inspired,”
participate in the “infallibility” of whatever proceeds ex cathedra,
“from the tripod of truth”; the burden of responsibility transferred to
other shoulders (BG, III, 30 magi sarvâni karmâni sahayasya) no longer
adds to the sum of his mortality and we can say: “O King, live for ever.”
When we speak of a King as “His Serene Highness” we are speaking
precisely of the truly royal quality of self-possession by which a King, if
he be really a King, is indeed “exalted.”

Thus from the standpoint of Indian sociological theory and that of
all traditional politics, an individual tyranny, whether that of a despot,
that of an emancipated artist, or that of the self-expressive man or self-
sufficient woman, effects in the long run only what is ineffective (akṛtāni,
“misdeeds”): all self-importance leads to the disintegration and finally
the death of the body politic, collective or individual. The essence of the
traditional politics amounts to this, that “Self-government” (svarāj)
depsends upon self-control (atmasanyāma), Rule on ruliness. One may
say that this conception of government survives even in modern India,
since the political victory foreseen by Gandhi is assuredly one that can
only be achieved by a self-conquest.

The King is such by Divine Right and Appointment, and by the same
token the Executive of a higher than his own will; or if he rules only by
might and does his own will, he is a Tyrant and must be disciplined.

“For this expression see Massou-Oursel, “Une connexion dans l’esthétique de
la philosophie de l’Inde,” Revue des Arts Asiatiques, 11, 1925.
The same applied to the individual who, if only concerned with the good of the work to be done and not with himself, and if he thinks of "himself" only as an instrument governed by his art, is worthy of all honor, but if he asserts and seeks to express himself, worthy of all dishonor and shame.

The Kingship envisaged by the Indian and traditional doctrine is thus as far removed as could well be from what we mean when we speak of an "Absolute Monarchy" or of "individualism." The supposedly "Machin-velium" Arthaśāstra flatly asserts (I.6) that only a ruler who rules himself can long rule others: "Whatever Sovereign, even one whose dominion extends to the ends of the earth, is of perverted disposition and ungoverned senses (vīruddhīr vṛtīr avāhyendriyaḥ) must quickly perish," going on to say that

"The Whole of This Science Has To Do With a Victory Over the Powers of Perception and Action." 12

12 The ēndriyaśi are the five organs of sense, the five corresponding internal faculties, and the mind (smanas); these correspond to what are called by Christian writers the "powers of the soul." They are properly called ēndriyaśi because of their belonging to Indra, whose they are (cf. Ts. 1.6.12.1). They are, in fact, the "powers" (āṇiśā) by which Indra is "empowered" (āṇīśavat) and is the "Lord of Power" (āṇīśapati), as he is of Indrāni (āṇīśapati... pariśā, RV.X.86.11,12). Taken together, the āṇiśā are āṇi; the ēndriyaśi, Indrāni; the powers of the soul, the soul herself. The marriage of Indra and Indrāni is that of the Sun and Moon, Eros and Psyche.

Rightly curbed, the ēndriyaśi are "powers of rule," but allowed full rein, are the "ruling passions" to which we are subjected.

13 "Kṛtvan hi śāstraṃ śām ēndriya-yajoḥ.

The concept of "Victory" is of the utmost importance in the traditional theory of Kingship. Exoterically it is by an actual or implied victory over others that a King obtains the throne, but esoterically he is the true Victor who subdues his own passions, allying himself with the Self against himself. In Islam this becomes the concept of the "Holy War" (jihād) as distinguished from mere wars of conquest. The "heroism" (viṁśa, śādīśa) expected of the Knight (śādīśa), whether as King or as the Mortal Soul and Outer Man, is then no longer a matter of merely physical courage (such as animals also possess), but a symbol and evidence of self-conquest and self-knowledge, autonomy, as we have seen, being the outward tally of an inward Self-control. Whoever has thus found Himself is necessarily both fearless and "invulnerable" (AV.X.844, BG.II, etc.). When the martyr says: "I have fought the good fight," this good fight is the Holy War. This does not mean that the two wars must be separately fought; the man-at-arms may be waging a war that is humanly speaking "just," and, if he be a Comprehensor, at the same time one that is "holy." In the latter case the battle itself becomes a sacrificial rite. It is in this way that it can be said of War that "Some he has marked out to be Gods, and some to be men, some to be enslaved and some to be set free" (Heraclitus, Fr. XLIV). It is one
The application is to the "King," the "man of action" and "artist" in any domain whatever; there is nothing that can be truly and well done or made except by the man in whom the marriage of the Sacerdotium and the Regnum has been consummated, nor can any peace be made except by those who have made their peace with themselves."
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thing to be "free" to do what one likes; only to have the "Victory over pleasures" (δόξα δοξών πίνα, Plato, Laws 840 C) is to be really free.

It is clear from the great king Asoka's Thirteenth Edict that he had understood the real meaning of "Victory"; for after recounting his political victories and expressing his deep regret for them, because of the suffering inflicted on the conquered, he continues (line 7), "And this is the foremost Victory, the Victory of the Dharma," while (line 10, 11) he enjoins upon his successors to "regard as 'Victory' the Victory of the Dharma, which avails for this world and the other."

In the beginning, it was the Brahma-Yakṣa that won the Victory (over the Asuras) for the Devas, and it is asked: "Can he be conquered who is a Comprehensor of that Great First-born Yakṣa, who knows that Brahma to be the Truth!" (TS. VI. 5. 7. 4, JUB. IV. 21, Kena U. 14 f., etc.).

"What is the best thing of all for a man, that he may ask from the Gods? "That he may be always at peace with himself." 

Contest of Homer and Hesiod, 320.
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