

## On Translation : Māyā, Deva, Tapas

Considered from a literary point of view, and still more with reference to their original value as *sādhana*, means to realisation, existing translations of Vedic texts may be described as amounting to little more than “cribs,” of real use only as tools and in the hands of students who can and will take pains to consult the original texts. This is tantamount to saying that the Sacred Books of the East are even today inaccessible to those, and these the vast majority, who cannot read or even refer to the original texts. If, as many think, the only possible rapprochement of the West and East must be effected intellectually, herein lies the primary obstacle to a mutual understanding.

Mistranslation is not to be attributed to a lack of assiduity, nor to an inadequate mastery of Oriental languages on the part of scholars, but much more to their inadequate use of English. It would be an excess of consideration to deny that mistranslation has been in part the consequence of an unconscious religious bias in the minds, or rather hearts, of scholars, who beside having no facility of reference to first principles, are often subconsciously reluctant to allow that some other and non-Christian doctrine may possibly have meant the same thing that an accepted Christian doctrine may have meant to themselves, or if not to them individually, at least in European tradition. On the other hand, supposing a total absence of any religious bias in any modern scholar, his purely scientific outlook and special education will almost inevitably preclude in him a knowledge of Christian metaphysics, theology, and mystical literature where only is to be found the English terminology required for adequate translation. Such terms as unground, unknowing, abyss, procession, Spiritus, spiration, essence, nature, substance, hypostasis, regard, magic, angel, consonantia, comprehensor, are entirely unknown to him in their technical significance. Oriental translators, having acquired their

vocabulary and point of view mainly from the published works of European scholars, are similarly limited.

In illustration of what has been said I offer *suggestions raisonnées* as to the rendering of three well known Sanskrit words, viz. Māyā, Deva, and Tapas, proposing that they should be rendered consistently by "Magic," "Angel," and "Intension," or retained in their original forms untranslated.

### *Māyā*

Māyā is one of the names of Prakṛti, the formative power or agency of manifestation in Īśvara, the Self-determined Self (Ātman), in which Self Puruṣa and Prakṛti subsist as conjoined principles. (1) In other words, in the arrangement of the Self, Puruṣa is "that of which," Ākāśa (2) "that wherein," Māyā "that whereby" there can be manifestation, actuality (*satya*), "life."

This manifestation, which we miscall "nature" (3) and which is the phenomenal World (*jagat, loka*), exists only *in act*, never pausing to *be*. Māyā-vāda doctrine does not assert that the World is Māyā, nor that the World does not become (4), but merely that it becomes in a certain way, viz. having Māyā as its ground (*pradhāna*) or means of becoming. Śūnya-vāda

(1) The Sāṃkhya asserts an eternal distinction of Puruṣa and Prakṛti, and this distinction requires no proof so long as the standpoint of logic, implied in the term Sāṃkhya Darśana, "Enumeration Point of View," is adhered to. The Vedānta is not in opposition to the Sāṃkhya as such, but assumes another Point of View (Darśana), viz. the Advāita (Non-Dual), in which the ever-existent Duality is envisaged, not as annihilated, but as subsumed in an Eternal Unity. So then, while Sāṃkhya by definition deals with Existence (Satya), Vedānta points out that the two "Persons" known in relation are of one Essence, viz. Ātman.

(2) Elemental space, the Playground of the Spirit (*prāṇārāma*), finite by definition, though endless: "located" in the "lotus of the heart".

(3) "Nature" might have been a legitimate rendering of "Māyā" were it not for our habitual error in identifying Mother Nature (*natura naturans*) with her children, the World, *ens naturata*.

(4) How far removed is the Vedānta from a "denial of the world" can be seen in Śaṅkarācārya's own words with reference to the Ātman as BLISS: "On the vast canvas of the Self, the Self itself paints the picture of the manifold worlds, and the Supreme Self itself takes great delight in the sight thereof" (*Svātmanī-rūpaṇa*, 95).

doctrine, which cannot be divorced from that of Tathatā, "Suchness" and that of Yathābhūta, "As is," does not assert that the World does not become : what it asserts is that the World is at once "Void" (5) and "Suchness." That is, the World is unreal to the extent that we think of it as a Duality of separate self-subsistent (*svāvasthīta*) principles, but real in its Suchness, "As is"; which is only another way of expressing the Vedāntic view. The only further doctrine conceivable (6) might be called Ātma-vāda, with reference to the doctrine of Ātman as *misunderstood* in early Buddhism, where it is supposed that the Vedas posit Ātman (Self) as Subject in relation to Object; it need only be pointed out that in fact the Ātman is "not so" (*neti, neti*). So then what the Vedānta denies is that knower and known, etc. (although separately *conceivable* from our point of view) "are" separate and self-subsistent (*svāvasthīta, svayambhū*) entities; what it asserts is that knower and known, etc., "are" conjoint aspects of the Self (Ātman), which Self is manifested in the Unity of Pure Act as the Becoming of the World (7). In other words, the World *is* the Self (Ātman) or Suchness (Tathatā); through our empirical understanding of the World is Error (Avidyā).

"By my Māyā I (Self) become (the World)" (8). As neither agent nor agency is synonymous with act (becoming), so Māyā is not the World (*jagat, loka*) of existences (*bhūtāni*). Māyā may be called Moha, delusion or illusion, that *by which*

(5) Śūnya, not elemental Space (Ākāśa), the *sine qua non* of existence, but Absolute Void, an "aspect" of non-existence.

How far removed is the Mahāyāna point of view from a denial of the world (in the sense that we deny the "horns of a hare" or the "son of a barren woman" appears in the magnificent equation *yas saṃsāras tat nirvāṇam*, "the circus of the world is in itself enfranchisement".

(6) We cannot take into serious account the "common sense" view that things "are what they seem" : sufficiently refuted by other "common sense" observation "all is not gold that glitters," not to mention the familiar example of the rope mistaken for the snake.

(7) The Vedānta more often expresses this directly, without reference to the conjoined principles (Puruṣa and Prakṛti, Prajāpati and Vāc, etc., (Christian "Person" and "Nature", "Father" and "Word")) by an affirmation of the "non-duality" (*advāita*) of the Self (Ātman), and the formula "That art thou".

(8) References in this paragraph are to *Bhagavad Gītā*, IV, 6 and VII, 13-15, and 27. Cf. *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, I, 10 and IV, 8-10.

the World is deluded (*mohita*); but those deluded (*muḍha*) beings of fallen nature (*asura-bhāva*) whose pure Intelligence (*prajñā*) has been torn away by Māyā are not themselves illusions, for however remote may be their Enfranchisement (*māyā-nivṛtti*, *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, I, 10) may be, even of these it can still be said "That art thou." By what net (*jāla*, *kalīla*) then is the World deluded "that it knows not Me (Self)"? By the properties (the three *guṇas*, viz. energy, mobility, inertia) variously perceived in beings, so that they are mutually distinguished; and by the "pairs" (*dvandvāu*), notions whereby the world is seen as thesis and antithesis. The delusion of the ego consists in its erroneous perception of the world, itself included, as a plurality of self-subsistent units, and its consequent attachment to or aversion from such units as such. This "delusion", in its personal aspect *abhimāna*, egoity, "I-ness", "original sin," is shared by God himself, in so far as he is in the world as Puruṣa, Person, Eternal Man; but it would be an aspect of the same delusion to conceive of God (him-Self) objectively as having any potentiality whatever not completely actualised in the totality of simultaneous becoming, delusion that is, to conceive of "Him" as other than the world *sub specie aeternitatis*. To deny a self-subsistence to the world is not a negation of anything whatever, in any other sense than that in which we deny the actuality of the horns of a hare, or deny that omnipotence could make that which has been or may be in time, (and therefore is beyond time), not to have been or to become in time or not to be the farther shore of time.

Needless to remark that what is called action, life, change, and euphemistically "progress," really represents nothing more than a sequence of the reactions of the ego to the qualities and pairs of opposites, and that all such unaware and functional reaction represents, from the Vedic point of view, not Life, but merely "living". For example, the acquisition of information is not "Life," but only a reaction of the knower to the known (fact). More specifically, knowledge as Realisation is Life, the Life of the Self, neither in the knower nor the known, but in itself as *adaequatio* (Skr. *tadākāratā*) *rei et intellectus*, immediate and eternal act : art is in the same way Life, neither in the seer nor the seen, the artist nor the work, but in itself as *consonantia*

(Skr. *sādṛśya*) *diversorum*; devotion and desire (*bhakti*, *prema*, *kāma*) not in the lover or beloved, but in the meeting of lover and beloved in the undimensioned cave of the heart, "Verily not for love of any angel, husband, wife, being or possession whatsoever dear, but for the love of Self," *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, II, 4, 5, and "He who approaches (9) any angel other (than the Self), thinking 'He is one and I another,' knoweth not (*na sa veda*)," *ibid.* L, 4, 10. That only is "Life" from the Vedic point of view which is thus experienced immediately at the core of "our" consciousness, in the transcendental Self; and is outwardly manifested in a pure facility or spontaneity (Skr. *sahaja*, Chinese *shên*, Muḥammadan *islām*, Christian resignation (10) without anxiety or motive (*a-sakta*), as action that is not action (11). The "Gospel" of the Veda, though the Veda speaks in terms of knowledge and not according to the *bhakti-vāda* (religion), is the doctrine that this enfranchisement, freedom and enlargement in the fullest sense of the words (12) is always and forever virtually realised and actually realisable: "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you," "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (13).

(9) *Upāsthe*, employed also with reference to carnal union, cf. *ibid.*, VI, 4, 1-3.

(10) Positively understood, *sannyāsa* as incentive (*Bhagavad Gītā*, III, 30). This is an antithesis of fatalism, cf. BOETHIUS "the further a thing is from the First Mind, the more it is involved in the chain of fate" (*De. Consol.* IV, cited by ST. THOMAS, *Sum. Th.*, I, Q. 116, A. 4). "—although the holy doctors avoided the use of this word (fate), on account of those who twisted its application to a certain force in the disposition of the stars" *ibid.* A. 2.

It may be remarked that the four terms bracketed in explanation of "facility" are not quite of one kind, *sahaja* and *shên* representing effect, and *islām* and Christian resignation cause. But cause and effect in immediate experience are the same.

(11) *Bhagavad Gītā*, IV, 17. ECKHART, I, 149, "The just seeks nothing in his work; only thralls and hirelings ask anything for work, or work for any why... have no ulterior purpose in thy work... enter thou into thine own ground and work; works wrought by thee there are all living."

(12) *Mukti*, *mokṣa*, *nir-vāṇa*, as *an-āvṛtti*, *a-sakta*, "enlargement," "freedom," in the fullest sense of the words.

(13) According to ST. THOMAS: in pure being (Self as subject) intellect and will tend not to anything external but remain in, and are, the subject or agent, nature being one with essence. A vital procession of intellect and will takes place respectively as (1) intelligible act (knowledge, art) and (2) actual love (Vidyāpati's "Each is both"), that is, in so far "as the object loved is in the lover... the object spoken of or understood is in the intelligent agent." Life "does

Māyā then is “nature” strictly and technically, not “Nature” as the world, which ought properly to be described as “natured,” *prakṛti-ja* or *prākṛta* (14); Māyā being the means by which manifestation is effected. The Creator (Prajāpati, etc., or Īśvara *qua* Prajāpati-Vāc, Father and Word), as master of this means, is designated Māyā-vin; the world is *māyā-maya* “made of” or “in the mode of” *māyā*, “magical”. . . Further, the comparison is made of his creations, productions or manifestations with those of the mortal magician whose *indra-jāla* (“net of Indra”) is a bewildering (*moha-kalīla*) or spell-binding (*vaṣī-karaṇa*) analogous to the very world as we perceive it sensibly. English “magic” and “magician” in this sense are exemplified in the “pleye” (*līlā*) and person of Merlin, as described in the fifteenth century English version of a *Roman de Merlin* no longer extant in full : “quod Merlin... I cowde here reyse a Castell, and I cowde make with-oute peple grete plente that it sholde assaile, and with-ynne also peple that it sholde defende, and yet I sholde do mo maistries, for I cowde go upon this water and not wet my feet, and also I cowde make a river where as neuer hadde be water,” which he performed, making all these things to proceed from the forest (Brioke) and to be seen in a circle “in myddel of the launde,” and when they had “long dured,” to return at the close of day to the forest, disappearing “sodaynly, that con ne wiste where thei were become” (15). As BÖHME says, “The Magician has power in

---

not proceed from potentiality to act,” but is all act. (*Sum. Th.* I, Q. 27, A. 2 and A. 4). Similarly ECKHART, almost in the words of the Upaniṣad, “God is in all things self-intent” (I, 380), “tireless in working as in loving, and it is all the same to him what he is loving. Which shows the love is God... The good man... formed in the image of God... loves for his own sake, that is to say he is loving for love’s sake, working for work’s sake, for the same reason that God is loving and working without ceasing : divine activity is his nature, his being, his life, and his felicity... the good man behaves the same as God not only in loving all he loves and doing all he does on account of God whom he loves therein and for whom he works, but in loving too (i.e. at the same time and by the same act) and working for himself, the lover” (II, 66-67), where “God” and “the good man” are the Self.

(14) Bhāva = (*Māyā Bhagavad Gītā*, VII, 13, 14) is “nature” universally : *sva-bhāva*, nature generically or individually, as when we speak of the “horse-nature” or “horsiness” whereby a horse is a horse, or of the specific nature by which a given horse is that horse and no other.

(15) *Merlin*, II, 309-311, Early English Text Soc., vol. 21, 1899. The accuracy and precision of the passage cited above will not be overlooked,

this Mystery (*Mysterium Magnum*, the Divine *emanation*) to act according to his will, and can do what he pleases," forasmuch as "each mysterium is the mirror and model of the other," though "he must be armed in that element wherein he would create" (16).

It is again BÖHME who explains the world as the creation of a Divine Magician using a Divine Magic: "Magic is the mother of eternity, of the being (existence) of all beings... the original state of Nature... a matrix without substance, but manifests itself in the substantial being... it has in it the *Fiat*... in Magic are all forms of Being of all beings. It is a mother in all three worlds, and makes each thing after the model of that thing's will. It is not the understanding, but it is a creatrix according to the understanding, and lends itself to good or to evil... Magic is the mother from which Nature comes, and the understanding is the mother coming from Nature... In sum, Magic is the activity in the Will-spirit" (17).

Magic is thus God's skill or art *whereby* He manifests or brings about the becoming of the world; and is in other beings by participation, or as "the mirror or model of the other." Nothing further is required in proof that Sanskrit "Māyā" should be translated as English "Magic."

### *Deva*

Īśvara (saguṇa Brahman, Ātman) and personal names such as Śiva or Viṣṇu when applied to Īśvara are the only proper Sanskrit equivalents to "God" in the Christian sense; the *nirguṇa* Brahman being Godhead. From the fact that Īśvara is also Deva, Bhūta, Yakṣa, Asura, etc., though the chief in each of these classes (as is often denoted by the prefix Mahā, "Great," as in Mahādeva), and inasmuch as each of these generic designations can be applied with reference to an indefinite variety of states of being in the "Three Worlds", has arisen the widespread notion of a Hindu

---

though it may well be that the later Arthurian authors no longer "understood" their material. Celtic mythology, including "Merlin" and the "Grail legend" (for which see my *Yakṣas*, II, 37 f.) represent a survival of ancient tradition as to Life, parallel to what of the same tradition is preserved in orthodox doctrine.

(16) BÖHME, *Sex Puncta Mystica*, VI, 2-5 (A.D. 1620), in EARLE's version. (*Six Theosophic Points*, and other writings, New York, 1920.)

(17) BÖHME, *Sex Puncta Mystica*, V.

polytheism; just as from the Muḥammadan point of view the Christian Trinity represents a polytheism, though this is an erroneous interpretation (18). But as a Christian may say, and ECKHART does, that God is “just Being,” and must yet speak of other “beings” of all sorts without intending that God is merely *a* being amongst others perhaps inferior or equal to another, so both a unity and hierarchy are taken for granted in the Vedic terms Deva, etc. Even within Christianity there has been discussion as to the propriety of calling God an angel, the general conclusion being that this is rather a matter of convenience than of faith, the “Angel of Great Counsel” of Isaiah, IX, 6, Sept. Ver., presumably referring to God, cf. ECKHART’s expression “premier angel”, and the “One Angel” of *Bṛhadār. Up.*, I, 2, 7.

The usual and indiscriminate rendering of Deva as “God” or “god,” while referable in part to *idées fixes* presuming pagan polytheism, has also an etymological sanction, and affords a good example of the kind of error that can arise from a careless dependence on a scientifically correct derivation, Deva corresponding in fact to Latin *deus*, English deity, divine, though warning might well have been taken from Zend *daeua* that Sanskrit Deva need not always denote precisely “God”.

Deva is literally “Shining One”; the proper rendering is “Angel,” the higher Devas being principles or pure intelligences or “Aeons”, whose “shining” (*prabhā, prakāśa*), represented in art as a nimbus or rays, is reflected in the possibilities of existence (Māyā, or Āpaḥ the “Waters”) as actuality, existence. Devas and Devatās are called the “limbs” or “members” (*aṅga*) of Brahman, or the “attributes” (*bhakti*) or “powers” (*vibhūti*) of the Ātman according to their hierarchy (*sthāna-vibhāga*): just as the Christian Angels are the ministers, powers, and messengers of God, in their hierarchies and orders. The correspondence extends so far that just as in the Indian tradition

(18) One can very well understand how the Islāmic doctors could misinterpret the doctrine of the Trinity as polytheism, if we consider such statements as ST. THOMAS. “We do not say *the only God*, for Deity is common to several” (Sum. Theol., I, Q. 31, X. 2). What is even more remarkable, “... holy men are called gods by participation,” ST. THOMAS, *Sum. Th.*, I, Q. 108, A. 5. Indic scholars might have taken warning here before they took for granted “polytheism” or invented “kathenotheism”.

we find the seats and vehicles (*āsana, vāhana*) and attributes and weapons (*āyudha puruṣa*, etc.) of the Devas, Īśvara included, themselves also spoken of and represented iconographically as Devas, so the Christian hierarchies include in the highest choir an order of "Thrones," and in the second one of "Powers"; the virtue of the Powers being at God's Will "to impose order on those subject to them," to "coerce the evil spirits," and so forth, just as the Āyudha Puruṣas of Indian Devas appear at their command, and are the means by which their will is carried out. Angels and Archangels are orders in the lowest choir, whose functions are most nearly connected with human life, they being sent as messengers to men, or acting as regional or individual guardians, for which there are abundant parallels in Indian tradition, even to the existence of individual guardians (*ārakkha devatā*). Vedic and Christian tradition are also in agreement as to the angelic independence of local movement. And finally, while the number of the Devas is often said to be thirty three thousand, and that of the angels incalculable, the words of ST. THOMAS "nor is this said to signify that this is the precise number of angels" can be applied in both cases (19).

Further, when the Devas as individuals are called "undying" (*amara*) this refers to their perpetuity on a given plane-of-being (*loka*) not subject to any further change of state (*punar mṛtyu*), "again death" (20) in the course of Time, though this does

---

(19) Authorities for all the statements in the foregoing paragraph are : Yāska, *Nirukta*, VII, 5; *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, 70, 71, 73 74 and 98; *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, III, 9; *Tāittirīya Upaniṣad*, I, 5, *angānyanya devatāḥ*; my *Yakṣas*, Pts. I and II; ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theologica*, I, Q. 107, A. 4, *ibid.*, Q. 108, A. 5-7, *ibid.*, Q. 112, A. 4, and *ibid.*, Q. 113, A. 1.

(20) Vedic tradition envisages the voyage (*yāna*) of the individual after death as a passing on from one plane of being to another, with the possibility of perpetuity on any given plane until the end of time, with a return to incarnation in another age, for those who have not achieved either a total or even partial gnosis. The later doctrine of incarnation in which the possibility of a return to a previous or even lower plane seems to represent the edifying tendencies of the religious extensions, perhaps incorporating popular non-Vedic elements, cf. my *Yakṣas*, I, p. 14, note 1. The idea of actual rebirth on any former plane in the case of a "special incarnation" (*avatāra*) is avoided, in the case of the Buddha, by the doctrine of *nirmāṇa-kāya*, which corresponds to the Docetic heresy in Christianity (the Son of Man = *nirmānakāya*, Christ in Glory = *sambhogakāya*, Christ as Logos = *dharma-kāya*).

The word *karma* ought not to be rendered "causality," but simply "works,"

not preclude the natural return of their being to Brahman at the end of Time (*kalpānta*) (21), a kind of death, indeed, but absolutely, *mors janua vitae* (22). The Devas are also called

“action,” “making,” etc. In so far as we can think at all of cause and effect as separated in time, the word *apūrva*, “latency,” “non-immediacy” represents the nearest equivalent of “causality”; the *pūrva-kara-kyta-vāda*, “due to former action doctrine” asserting that antecedent action has determined present event. Cf. EDGERTON, *Mīmāṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa*, New Haven, 1920.

“Reincarnation” as interpreted by Buddhists (and now by Theosophists) is hardly a Vedic doctrine. Even the descent of the Pitṛs, “Fathers” (a collective term) is not a return of individuals as such to a former state of being, but in a far more general way the unforeseen (*adyṣṭa*) working out of antecedent or “inherited” causes in present effect. Devayāna and Pitṛyāna are the ascent and descent on Jacob’s ladder.

(21) Mahā-Pralaya, in Christian terms the “Last Judgement.” Those “judged” and admitted to “heaven,” that is absolute and non-contingent immortality, correspond to those in Vedic terms who have achieved a partial realization following the *pitṛ-yāna* or *deva-yāna*: the judged and “damned” to those whose bondage (*pāśa*, individuation, ignorance, sin) has been such as to preclude the possibility of even a partial and deferred enfranchisement (*krāma-mukti*), and must therefore await in an “everlasting” but not eternal latency, their mortal rebecoming in another Time (*kalpa*), when naturally the possibility of achieving or not achieving a deferred or an immediate total realization will again present itself. “Damnation” in this sense, that is to say a self-condemnation to an endless (though not eternal) latency, a relative (though not absolute) annihilation, is adjudged to those who conceive the Ego as the Self, thinking that to act “for the sake of the Self” means nothing but to satisfy every desire of the Ego, by serving the body here and now; those who live by such an “Asura Upaniṣad” as this “shall perish,” *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VIII, 8. In Christian terms, the “Fall” consisted in an assertion of the independence, self-subsistence, of the Ego (Satan’s claim to “equality” with God). The same in nature, is described as an eating of the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil (which is the Tree of Life conceived in terms of the “pairs of opposites”). This Tree may be seen by the Self with great delight, as it grows in the Garden of Life (*prāṇārāma*); but the fruit thereof (“things as they are in themselves,” not as “they are in God”) assimilated (*tadākytvā*) by the Ego, is deadly venom (*viṣa*, cf. root *viṣ* in other senses); eating of the fruit is a taking on of what is nothing in itself, so “Mortal Sin” against the Spirit, Death from the standpoint of Eternal Life. Only the Self can swallow such venom and yet Live: as Śiva does when by another image the *dvandva* is produced at the Churning of the Sea of Milk (“Waters,” the possibilities of being), the marks of which are the blue-black stain on His throat as Nilakaṇṭha, Viṣakaṇṭha, Viṣāgnipā, and His “addiction” to drugs. The apparent subjection of the Self to the tragedy (*arta*) of “life,” that accepted pain, is the Passion of God and Everyman.

(22) Bodhisattvas are conceived of either as *ājānaja-devāḥ* (Tāitt. Up., II, 8) “natural” or “begotten angels”; or as having taken birth, and then as *karma-devāḥ* (ibid.) “angels will respect to works”, enduring after death as Saviours or Intercessors until the end of Time, or it may be forever in Time

undying not as individuals, but as to the station (*sthāna*) occupied, and this refers to their eternity as principles, as when we say that in another age some other individual than is the present Indra will occupy the throne of Indra. From the latter point of view, in the *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, VI, 9, 15 f., the Devas are spoken of as a first emanation (*prathamam aśygram*), an enduring utterance (*sthita vyāhṛtiḥ*), and contrasted in this with individual existences (*mānuṣyāḥ*, “men,” “mortals”) whose existence is “day by day” (*svaḥ, svaḥ*). In complete accord with this, it is asserted by ST. GREGORY and ST. AUGUSTINE, “*angelus nomen est officii, non naturae*”; and just as certain of the higher Devas are not involved at the end of time, so “the angelic orders... according to the difference of grace and nature... will ever remain...(but) as to the execution of the angelic offices it will to a certain degree remain, and to a certain degree will cease”—at the Day of Judgment (ST. THOMAS, *Sum. Th.*, I. Q. 108, A. 7). And further, just as the deceased are in part to be spoken of as Devas (and this is one of the specific reasons why the rendering of Deva as “God” or “god” is improper) so “men can merit glory in such a degree as to be equal to the angels, in each of the angelic grades; and this implies that men are taken up into the orders of the angels” (ST. THOMAS, *ibid.*, A. 8).

It has now been sufficiently demonstrated by a detailed collation of corresponding notions as to the nature and functions of Devas and Angels, that the rendering of Deva as “God” or “god” (22a) (which last means little more nor less than “false god”) is only legitimate when the highest Deva is expressly or implicitly referred to, and that in all, or almost all other cases the word “Angel”

---

and Time again, notwithstanding that total despiration (*nirvāṇa*) is fully within their grasp. Bodhisattvas of the latter type correspond to the Vedic Apāntaratamas and others, the possibility of whose reincarnation (*avataraṇa*) despite their attainment of Perfect Gnosis, is discussed by Śaṅkarācārya, Comment. on Vedānta Sūtras, III, 3, 30, 31. The following passage very especially applicable to the case of a Bodhisattva: “In the case of beings of this kind, who owing to particular deeds have been appointed to particular offices, the effect of the works which have risen to the office does not pass away before those offices are completely accomplished.” Any such descent involves a Passion, of which Siddhārtha’s Abhinīṣkramaṇa affords a specific instance.

(22a) Both “God” and “god” should be excluded from translations of Pali texts, where Brahmā is not the supreme deity, but only the highest of the Angels, and the Buddha is not yet “deified”.

should be employed. The same will hold good for Yakṣa in most contexts, but Yakṣas, though in one hierarchy, are of very diverse orders, some being fairies and elves rather than angels; it is generally best to retain the original word. When Deva and Asura occur together, the same generic designation must be applied to both (just as Michael and Satan are equally "Angels"), and if a distinction has to be made Asura must be translated "Dark Angel" or better "Daimon". It remains to point out that *Viśve Devatāḥ*, the "Several Angels", generally (e.g. *Bṛhad Devatā*, I, 69 f.) means the three Persons of the Trinity (*tridhā*). But as expressed by ECKHART (II, 153) "the angel hosts are countless," but "to one who knows distinction apart from time and number an hundred would be the same as one."

### *Tapas*

The practise of *tapas* is primarily an intellectual process by which the creative powers of any being are strengthened and focussed; with an empirical equivalent in the practise of various austerities by Yogīs or others. Examples are the *tapas* practised by the Deity (God as Creator with respect to a given temporal cycle) preparatory to the creation of a universe; and the *pañcāgni tapas* of Umā practised with a view to regaining Śiva's specific partiality. *Tapas* is a passion voluntarily undertaken, and with a known end in view. It might well be described as a raising of the spiritual potential to the sparking point: Böhme's "flash", "flagrat", "enkindling", or Hebrew *zimzum*. The usual rendering of *tapas* is "penance"; but notwithstanding that the notions of pain, effort, sweating, and fusion are symbolically present, "penance" is altogether improper, inasmuch as there is no idea of expiation with reference to the past, but only of a tension towards a future end. Śaṅkarācārya (23) explains *tapas* as "*kṛcchra*, etc.," a noun from root *kṛṣ*. to draw together, obtain, master, and implying exertion, retention, etc. Now there are English words *intension*, defined (Webster) as "strain, energetic exercise (as of the mind), increase of power or energy"; *intense*, "showing its characteristic attribute in a high degree, wrought up to high activity"; and

(23) Commentary on *Tāittirīya Upaniṣad*, I, 9.

*intensify* (intrans.), “to become intense or more intense; to act with increasing power or energy.” From which it is sufficiently apparent that *tapas* should be rendered generally by “intension,” and the verb, *tap*, generally by “intensify.”

In conclusion: I conceive the proper end of “Comparative Religion,” regarded as a discipline, to be the demonstration of the identity of the common metaphysical tradition underlying all religious extensions: which when established (which can only be done intellectually, and not with any immediate view to edification, intellect being defined as “the habit of first principles”) will permit religions in the plural to exist side by side as variations necessitated by the infinity of the theme and the variety of human character, the thing being always in the knower according to the mode of the knower. What Europe has understood by “religious tolerance” is a merely negative conception, reached by way of scepticism and political convenience. The basic principle of tolerance is positive; in the words of YĀSKA, “We see actually that because of the greatness of God, the one principle of life is praised in various ways”; RUYSBROECK, “Because of his incomprehensible nobility and sublimity, which we cannot rightly name nor wholly express, we give Him all these names” (24). Cf. JALĀLU’D DĪN RŪMĪ, “I have bestowed on everyone a particular mode of worship. I have given everyone a peculiar form of expression”; IBN AL-‘ARABĪ, “God, the omnipresent and omnipotent, is not limited by any one creed, for He says (*Qur’ān*, II, 109) ‘Wheresoever ye turn, there is the face of Allāh’... If one understood Junayd’s saying ‘The water takes its colour from the vessel containing it’, he would not interfere with other men’s beliefs, but would perceive God in every form of belief”, and “I follow the religion of Love, whichever way his camels take”; Ḥāfīz “Where the turbaned anchorite chanteth Allāh day and night, church bells ring the call to prayer and the cross of Christ is there”; *Bhagavad Gītā*, IV, 11, “the path men take from every side is Mine”. Indeed, as AŚOKA, “the Darling of the Angels,” saw, “he who does reverence to his own sect while

---

(24) YĀSKA, *Nirukta*, VII, 5 cf. *Byhad Devaṭā*, I, 70 and 98. RUYSBROECK, *Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage*, Ch. XXV.

disparaging the sects of others, with intent to enhance the splendor of his own, in reality by such conduct inflicts the severest injury on his own" (25). Those who accept, understand, and live by the Vedic tradition cannot admit that it represents either a polytheism (25a), pantheism (25b,) or a denial of existence, and offer valid proofs in refutation of any terminology of this kind, such as scholars generally employ. Nor can an initial rapprochement of Europe and Asia be conceived on any other than an intellectual basis as above defined, not forgetting that from the Oriental and Scholastic (that is verily European) points of view, "art" is a part of intellect.

So then the importance cannot be exaggerated of rendering "the holy heathen books" not merely with grammatical accuracy, but as to specific terms in their context, with a precise awareness of their real meaning, and by means of the exact or nearest possible equivalents in English. This is of such immediate necessity that we ought not to hesitate to make over all existing translations that are not from this point of view entirely competent, remembering that translations are not made as ends in themselves, but to be read, marked, learnt, and inwardly digested. True that this would involve a drastic revision of almost all existing versions of Vedic texts, and much more besides; but the task is one the present generation ought not to shirk. The scholar is in duty bound by the terms of his vocation.

## APPENDIX

Appended is a sample version of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, I, 2, 1 and 2, where Genesis is traced as from the *nirguṇa* Brahman

(25) AŚOKA, Rock Edict XII.

(25a) *Bṛhad Devatā*, I, 70 and 98 : "Because of their Great-Self-hood (*mahātmya*) a diversity of names is given to the Angels... (but) the Divinity (*devatva*) of each Angel is from-their-being-of-one-sphere (*sālokyatvāt*) and of one-and-the-same-birth (*ekajātatvāt*) and because-of-the-immanence (*vyāptimatvāt*) of the Fiery-Energy (*tejas*) in them, though they are seen to be individually worshipped (*stutaḥ*)".

Whether the designation "polytheistic" can be properly applied to any known religion may be doubted. On the Sumero-Accadian pantheon from this point of view see LANDGON, *Semitic mythology*, p. 89.

(25b) Cf. *Rg Veda*, X, 90, 3, "One fourth of Him is all existences, three fourths immortal"; *Bhagavad Gītā*, VII, 12, "not I in them, but they in Me".

not yet determined as One; *ibid.*, I, 4, 17, where Genesis is traced from the *saguna* Brahman, already Self-determined One; and *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, VIII, 8, 1, where the creation is described almost in the terms of the Hebrew Genesis. Where Sanskrit words are rendered by more than one English word, this is indicated by hyphenation. Capitals denote the universal, lower case the general and particular. Sanskrit words are bracketed and some notes added in justification of my renderings; but the translation is designed to be intelligible to a reader altogether without Sanskrit. I claim that these are at once literal and literary versions, and so transparent as to be easily understood by anyone familiar with any other aspect of the same tradition, that is in the first place to any English reader familiar with the Old Testament.

*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, I, 2, b and 2.

In the beginning no thing whatsoever was here. This-all (*idam*) was veiled by Death (*mṛtyu*), by Privation (*aśanāyā*); for Privation is Death (26). That (*tad*) took on (*akaruta*) intellect (*manas*), "Let me be Selfed" (*ātmanvī syām*) (27). He (*saḥ*, the Self) gave out light (*arcan acarat*). Of Him, as He shone (*arcataḥ*) were the Waters (*āpaḥ*) born (*jāyanta*) (28). Verily whilst I shone, there was Delight" (*kam*), He said (*iti*) (29), This is indeed the Sheen (*arkatva*) of Shining (*arka*). Verily, there is affirmation for him who knoweth thus the sheen of shining.

The Waters, verily, were a (counter-)shining. What was the foam of the Waters, that solidified, that became-the-one (*vyāśavat*) Earth (*pṛthivī*). Thereon He strove (*aśrāmayat*). Thereafter (*tasyānta*) the Fiery-Energy (*tejas*) and Tincture (*rasa*) of His striving (*śrāntā*) and intension (*tāpta*) broke-forth-as (*niravartat*) Fire (*agni*) (30).

(26) "Lifelessness is... lack of an intrinsic form." ST. THOMAS, *Sum. Th.*, II, Q. 6, A. 2.

(27) Cf. *Tāittirīya Upaniṣad*, II, 7, *svayam akurut*.

(28) I.e., Light made visible the Possibilities of Being.

(29) Cf. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, VI, 4, 6. *Iti* is here German *also*.

(30) Conception of the "interior Word," His knowledge of Himself.

(*Ibid.*, 3, He (Self) becomes a threefold Principle of Life; and is described as elemental-space-body (*ākāśa-sarīra*, *Tāittiriya Upaniṣad*, I, 6) the wherein all the possibilities of being are to be realised. *Ibid.*, 4, as also in I, 4, 17 translated below, the manifested Self by entering into union with his own Nature, whose birth as Mother is the answer to his consciousness as Father, begets on Her the Year, that is Time, as All Things).

*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, I, 4, 17.

In the beginning This-All (*etad*) was just Self (*ātman*), One (*eka*). He (*saḥ*) willed (*akāmayat*): “ Let-there-be (*syād*, “ fiat ”) of Me (*me*) a wifely-birth (*jāyā*) that (*atha*) I may beget (*prajāyeya*). Let there be of Me Goods (*vitta*), that I may work Works (*karma kurvīya*) (31). So great indeed is Will (*kāma*) (32). Nor if one would could anyone get (*na... vindate*) more than that. Thereby-it-hangs (*tasmād*) that even here-and-now (*adya*) when one is single (*ekākī*) he wills “ Let there be of me a wife (*jāyā*), that I may beget. Let there be of me goods (*vitta*), that I may work works (*karma kurvīya*). And

---

(31) Often rendered “ sacrificial works ”; but though this is by no means excluded from the context, the sense is here wider. The Vedic view is that all works done with knowledge are ritual or sacrifice (*yajña*), cf. the application of this doctrine to carnal union, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, VIII, 4, 3.

(32) *Kāma*, as Will, is one of the essential names of Self; therefore susceptible of dual arrangement as Will (*Kāmadeva*) and Desire (*Rati*), and a threefold arrangement as Will (*kāma*), Delight (*ānanda*), and Desire (*trṣṇa*). The word *kāma* has in fact all these implications. Much confusion has been caused by the Buddhist conception of *Kāmadeva* only as a contracted (*tāmasika*) aspect of Desire. It was no doubt inevitable that in a system where the doctrine of Self was not understood, Will could be thought of only as a Thirsting (*taṣṭha*); it was in fact only with great difficulty that Buddhism came to conceive of a “ True ” Will (*satya kāma*, *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VIII, 3, 1; *dharmāvīruddha... kāma*, *Bhagavad Gītā*, VII, II) not motivated by a need, though this had been present in the notions “ *Kāma* ” *saṃkalpa*, and *vaśa* from Vedic times. And from the specifically Buddhist point of view, the identification of *Kāmadeva* with Death (*Māra*) and Satan (*Pāpman*) was correct. But Eros, as *primum mobile*, is a mighty Power, and cannot be so easily disposed of. In the same way Buddhism conceived of Death only in its *tāmasika* aspect as evil. Whereas (as we saw above, *Bṛhadār. Up.*, I, 2, 1) Death (*Mṛtyu*) and Indigence (*Aśanāyā*) are not less than Life and Abundance essential names of the Supreme Identity, whose nature-essence is the simultaneous pulse of Manifestation and Non-Manifestation (*vyakta, avyakta*), Existence and Non-existence (*sat, asat*).

in so far as he is indigent (*ekāika*) of these, verily he thinks " I am not whole (*kṛtsna*) ".

Now His (*tasya*) Wholeness (*kṛtsnatā*) (33) is thus : His intellect (*manas*) is Himself, His Word (*vāc*) is His wifely-birth (*jāyā*); His Spirit is His Begotten (*prajā*); His Eye (*cakṣu*) is his Rational (*mānasa*) Goods (*vitta*), for verily by Sight (*cakṣuṣā*) He comes-into-possession-thereof (*tad-vindate*); His Ear (*śrotṛa*) is His Angelic (*dāiva*) Goods, for verily by hearing (*śrotrena*) He heareth that (*tacchṛnoti*) (34); Himself (*ātman*) indeed is His Works (*karma*) for it is by-means-of-Himself (*ātmanā*) that He works Works.

The sacrifice (*yajña*) is five-fold. The Offered-beast (*paśu*) is five-fold. The Person (*puruṣa*) is five-fold. This all, whatever there be, is five-fold. Who knoweth This, wins (*apnoti*) All (35).

*Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, VII, 8, 1.

Unto the Waters (*āpaḥ*) came their Season (*ṛta*) (36). The

(33) Cf. Gnostic "Pleroma".

(34) Eye, as that whereby substantial form (*rūpa*) is sensed, and Ear as that whereby name (*nāma*) is heard, are symbols respectively of the sensible and intelligible worlds, particular and general : transcendental knowledge, requiring no organic symbol, has been mentioned above, " His intellect is Himself," where *manas* = *prajāñā*.

(35) " Five-fold " refers to the five vital spirits (*prāṇa*) and (or) Five Elements (*tannmātrā*). *Paśu* may be taken to mean " man " individually, cf. *ibid.*, I, 4, 10 : Puruṣa, Humanity, Universal Man, Adam. In Hume's versions of the above passages, careful as they are, the rendering of *arcan* as " praising," *kāma* as " desire," and *vāc* as " voice " are misleading. Cf. *Br. Up.* IV, 1, 2, *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VII, 2, 1 and *Kāuṣītaki Upaniṣad*, III, 5, where the meaning is in each case " Word," with *Br. Up.*, III, 2, 3, where *vāc* is really " voice," that is functional utterance, mere sound (*ṛta*) : combining these sources, it is clear that Name (*nāma*) comes between *vāc* as " Word " and *vāc* as " voice," as proximate determinant (*parastāt prati-vīdhānaka*) of the former, and " over-apprehender " (*ati-grāha*) of the latter.

(36) The Waters are all the possibilities of being, in themselves pure potentiality, no thing, this nothing being as it were at large in the elemental-space-body (*ākāśa-śarīra*) of the Self. " Where time has never entered in and no form was ever seen, at the centre, the summit, of the soul, there God is creating this whole world " (Eckhart, I, 164) : but more specifically, the possibilities of being with reference to a particular *loka* or *kalpa*. In any book of Genesis a chronological mode of expression is inevitable, but it must not be forgotten that all the possibilities of being are from eternity simultaneously potentialities and actualities, the Self-determined Self, the One, being Ever-Act and All-Act, as well as Inaction. The

Gale-of the Spirit (*Vāyu*) stirred (*ārcchat*) their Back (*pr̥stha*) (37) There-from became (*samabhavat*) a Fair-Thing (*vāma*) (38). Mitra-Varuṇa counter-saw-themselves (*paṛyyapaśyat*); they said "A Fair-Thing verily has here come to be amongst the Angels" (*deveṣu*) (39). Hence the Fair-Angelic (*Vāmadevyā*) chant.

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY.

Waters, Skr. Āpaḥ, feminine collective plural, are an aspect of Prakṛti, Vāc, Māyā, etc., that is, Potentiality as distinguished from Power, hence the propriety and poetry of *ṛtu*, implying "ripe unto conception," "full of promise."

(37) The Earth is often spoken of and represented as a lotus leaf floating on the "back" of the Waters, e.g. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, VII, 4, 1, 8 and X, 5, 2, 8; the "back" or "face" of the Waters being a given plane of being, *loka*. In a closely related figure the Earth is thought of as condensed foam, as in Br. Up., I, 2, 2, translated above. On this floating leaf or Earth the Creator lies *uttānapad* (RV., X, 72, 3), intensifying (*tapati*), until in the fulness of time there springs up from his navel as generative centre the Tree of Life (see my *Yakṣas*, II, pp. 1-3) which is also the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil (*dvandvāu*). In place of a lotus leaf we find very usually that the Deity reclining on the Waters is supported by the Nāga Ananta (Eternity as Permissive Principle of Time) as his couch (*śayana*). In another way the nascent Creator is represented as a child (Kṛṣṇa) cradled on a banyan leaf, floating on the infinite Sea, as Vāta-patra-śayin.

(38) That is, the World Picture (*jagaccitra*), cf. Śaṅkarācārya, *Svātmanirūpaṇa*, 95, cited above, Note 4; and ECKHART, "the words 'God saw was that it was good'... express a certain satisfaction taken by God in his works, as of an artist in his art," "finding his reflection most delightful".

(39) "The Angels" i. e. the Trinity of Fire, Supernal-Sun, and Spirit. The being of the natural or begotten Angels (*ājānaja devāḥ*) is, as we have already seen, eternal in *principio* and quā essential names of the Self; they are conceived of as already present at the stirring of the Waters, as above, or as taking part in the primordial drama (*ṛtya*) or in Churning of the Waters, *samudra manthana*, at which time the *karma-devāḥ*, "angels by works", are embodied.