



The Holy Land (III)

M. Capruta

The notion of *sacred* primarily bears the attribute of *significance*. Something *sacred* is something that bears meaning, something that addresses the intellect (*Buddhi*, *Nous*, *Spiritus*) and which is to be approached intellectually¹. The sacred unites all levels of existence, like an axis in the three dimensional geometry, or like a ray springing from the centre of a circle and continuing indefinitely to its peripheral confinement, in the two dimensional geometry. Consequently, we may say that the sacred addresses primarily the intuitive metaphysical intellect (*Spiritus*, *Nous*), then the rational physical intellect (*Animus*, *Eros*), then the psychic intuition that takes the forms of *sympathos* and *empathos* (*Anima*, *Psyche*)², and then the five somatic senses (*Corpus*, *Soma*). All levels can – and they do – participate to the sacred as long as one instance does not rebel against its government. When any other instance lower than Spirit decrees laws, these laws are, as we have already mentioned, untrue, being thus false and relative.

A normal individual human nature is able to perceive reality in its whole complex super-layered significance, grasping its meaning until the confinement of the pure reason, by which we understand the capacity of the clear distinction between God and man, between the Universal and the individual, between the Other and I. The capacity of making such a primordial and prehistorically distinction requires a previous very important understanding of identity: the understanding of the complete human nature, or in other words, the realization of the Primordial Man.

¹ That which has a meaning participates to the Truth. That which is false is not meaningless but relative, it is of an inferior nature by having a *tamas* tendency and it doesn't address the intellect, but the sensor. Rigorously speaking, there is no absolute falsehood (as there is no absolute relativity), but just a relative state of ignorance. The existence of the basest state is real, but its degree of reality is the most relative.

² Eros and Psyche, Animus and Anima are but One Instance in the Presence of the Third, who is the Spirit (*Spiritus*, *Nous*). Estranged from the Spirit, the couple is divorced, and the state of this couple shows its symptoms on its exterior garment, which is the somatic modality of the individual. To *Psyche* corresponds the *pathos* (Gr.) or the *pati* (Lat.). Eros is the *Eleytheron*, the Liberator, but also the Killer of the Psyche. In this respect, and from a certain point of view, He bears the function of Mikael, the Archangel with the Fiery Sword, and also the function of Chakravartin, the Key Holder and the Autocrat (*Monarchos*, Gr.), the Emperor. The sword and the arrow bear the same symbolism.

The Holy Land (III)

If we understand our origin *in time or space*, we are wrong. We are not subjects of history or land, but vice versa. We are subjects of Being. Home is within, in the hearth. The sacred fire does not burn because of historical and geographical conditionings. Time and Space, in themselves, cannot affect but time and space. That is to say that the limit limits only the limited. Everything that is “exterior” springs from within and it has in itself no reality if not the one given by its unique interior essence, which unites everything like a thread. The meaning that we give to the “exterior” is not necessarily – and in what concerns the modern man’s mentality, it most definitely isn’t – the real significance that this “exterior” possesses. A normal understanding of reality makes no distinction³ between interior and exterior, because seeing is recognizing, and that which has to be recognized is the Self, in Itself and in all Its states and modalities. There is nothing else but the Self. *Lā ilaha illa al-Lāh, Ehyeh asher ehyeh, Tat Tvam Asi.*

³ By *no distinction* we do not mean *confusion*.