



Who Is "Satan" and Where Is "Hell"? (II)

Ananda K. Coomaraswamy

As Jung so penetratingly observes: "When the fate of Europe carried it into a four years war of stupendous horror – war that no one wanted – hardly anyone asked who had caused the war and its continuation."¹ The answer would have been unwelcome: it was "I"—your "I" and mine. For, in the words of another modern psychologist, E. E. Hadley, "the tragedy of this delusion of individuality is that it leads to isolation, fear, paranoid suspicion, and wholly unnecessary hatreds."² All this has always been familiar to the theologians, in whose writings Satan is so often referred to simply as "the enemy." For example, William Law: "You are under the power of no other enemy, are held in no other captivity, and want no other deliverance but from the power of your own earthly self. This is the one murderer of the divine life within you. It is your own Cain that murders your own Abel,"³ and "self is the root, the tree, and the branches of all the evils of our fallen state . . . Satan, or which is the same thing, self-exaltation. . . . This is that full-born natural self that must be pulled out of the heart and *totally denied*, or there can be no disciple of Christ." If, indeed, "the kingdom of heaven is within you," then also the "war in heaven" will be there, until Satan has been overcome, that is, until the Man in this man is "master of himself," *selbes gewaltic*.

For the *Theologia Germanica* (chs. 3, 22, 49), it was the Devil's "I, Me, and Mine" that were the cause of his fall. . . . For the self, the I, the me and the like, all belong to the Evil Spirit, and therefore it is that he is an Evil Spirit. Behold one or two words can utter all that has been said by these many words: 'Be simply and wholly bereft of self.'" For "there is nothing else in hell, but self-will; and if there were no self-will, there would be no devil and no hell." So, too, Jacob Boehme: "this vile self-hood possesses the world and worldly things; and dwells also in itself, which is dwelling in hell"; and Angelus Silesius:

*Nichts anders stürzet dich in Höllenschlund hinein
Als dass verhasste Wort (merk's wohl!): das Mein und Dein.*⁴

¹ C. G. Jung, *The Integration of Personality* (New York, 1935), p. 274.

² R. E. Hadley, in *Psychiatry* V (1942), 133; citing also H. S. Sullivan, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-134; "emphasized individuality of each of us, 'myself.' Here we have the very mother of illusions, the ever pregnant source of preconceptions that invalidate almost all our efforts to understand other people."

³ William Law, *The Spirit of Love, and an Address to the Clergy*, cited in Stephen Hobbhouse, *William Law and Eighteenth Century Quakerism* (London, 1927), pp. 156, 219, 220.

⁴ Angelus Silesius, *Der Cherubinische Wandersmann*, v.238.

Who Is "Satan" and Where Is "Hell"? (II)

Hence the resolve, expressed in a Shaker hymn:

*But now from my forehead I'll quickly erase
The stamp of the Devil's great "I."*¹

Citations of this kind could be indefinitely multiplied, all to the effect that of all evil beasts, "the most evil beast we carry in our bosom,"² our most godless and despicable part" and "multifarious beast," which our "Inner Man," like a lion tamer, must keep under his control or else will have to follow where it leads.³

Even more explicit sayings can be cited from Sufi sources, where the soul (*nafs*) is distinguished from the intellect or spirit (*aql*, *rûh*) as the Psyche is distinguished from the Pneuma by Philo and in the New Testament, and as *anima* from *animus* by William of Thierry.⁴ For the encyclopedic *Kashfu'l Mahjûb*, the soul is the "tempter," and the type of hell in this world.⁵ Al-Ghazâlî, perhaps the greatest of the Muslim theologians, calls the soul "the greatest of your enemies"; and more than that could hardly be said of Satan himself. Abû Sâ'îd asks: "What is evil, and what is the worst evil?" and answers, "Evil is 'thou,' and the worst evil 'thou' if thou knowest it not"; he, therefore, called himself a "Nobody," refusing, like the Buddha, to identify himself with any nameable "personality."⁶

Jalâlu'd Dîn Rûmî, in his *Mathnawî*, repeats that man's greatest enemy is himself: "This soul," he says, "is hell," and he bids us "slay the soul." "The soul and Shaitân are both one being, but take two forms; essentially one from the first, he became the enemy and envier of Adam"; and, in the same way, "the Angel (Spirit) and the Intellect, Adam's helpers, are of one origin but assume two forms." The Ego holds its head high: "decapitation means, to slay the soul and quench its fire in the Holy War" (*jihâd*); and well for him who wins this battle, for "whoever is at war with himself for God's sake ... his light opposing his darkness, the sun of his spirit shall never set."⁷

¹ E. D. Andrews, *The Gift to be Simple* (New York, 1940), p. 18; cf. p. 79, "That great big I, I'll mortify."

² Jacob Boehme, *De incarnatione Verbi*, 1.13.13.

³ Plato, *Republic* 588c ff., where the whole soul is compared to such a composite animal as the Chimaera, Scylla, or Cerberus. In some respects the Sphinx might have been an even better comparison. In any case, the human, leonine, and ophidian parts of these creatures correspond to the three parts of the soul, in which "the human in us, or rather our divine part" should prevail; of which Hercules leading Cerberus would be a good illustration.

⁴ William of Thierry, *The Golden Epistle of Abbot William of St. Thierry to the Carthusians of Mont Dieu*, tr. Walter Shewring (London, 1930) §§50, 51.

⁵ *Kashf al-Mahjûb*, tr. R. A. Nicholson (*Gibb Memorial Series* XVII), p. 199; cf. p. 9, "the greatest of all veils between God and man."

⁶ For Abû Sâ'îd see R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism* (Cambridge, 1921), p. 53.

⁷ Citations are from *Mathnawî* 1.2617; 11.2525; in.374, 2738, 3193, 4053 (*nafs va shaitân har dû ek în bûd'and*); cf. 11.2272ft., v.2919, 2939. The fundamental kinship of Satan and the Ego is apparent in their common claim to independent being; and "association" (of others with the God who only *is*) amounts, from the Islamic point of view, to polytheism (*ibid.* iv.2675-77).

Who Is "Satan" and Where Is "Hell"? (II)

*'Tis the fight which Christ,
With his internal Love and Light,
Maintains within man's nature, to dispel
God's Anger, Satan, Sin, and Death, and Hell;
The human Self, or Serpent, to devour,
And raise an Angel from it by His Pow'r.*

John Byrorn

"Spark of the soul ... image of God, that there is ever in all wise at war with all that is not godly ... and is called the Synteresis"¹ (Meister Eckhart, Pfeiffer ed., p. 113). "We know that the Law is of the Spirit ... but I see another law in my members, warring against the Law of the Intellect, and bringing me into captivity. ... With the Intellect I myself serve the Law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin. . . Submit yourselves therefore to God: resist the Devil."² And similarly in other Scriptures, notably the *Bhagavad Gitâ* (vi.5, 6): "Lift up the self by the Self, let not self sit back. For, verily, the Self is both the friend and the foe of the self; the friend of one whose self has been conquered by the Self, but to one whose self hath not (been overcome), the Self at war, forsooth, acts as an enemy"; and the Buddhist *Dhammapada* (103, 160, 380), where "the Self is the Lord of the self" and one should "by the Self incite the self, and by the Self gentle self" (as a horse is "broken in" by a skilled trainer), and "one who has conquered self is the best of all champions." (Cf. Philostratus, *Vit. Ap.*, 1.13: "Just as we break in skittish and unruly horses by stroking and patting them.")

At the same time, it must not be forgotten that the Psychomachy is also a "battle of love," and that Christ – to whom "ye should be married ... that we should bring fruit unto God" (Rom. 7:3, 4) – already loved the unregenerate soul "in all her baseness and foulness,"³ or that it is of her that Donne says: "Nor ever chaste, except *Thou* ravish me." It was for nothing but "to go and fetch his Lady, whom his Father had eternally given him to wife, and to restore her to her former high estate that the Son proceeded out of the Most High" (Meister Eckhart).⁴ The Deity's lance or thunderbolt is, at the same time, his yard, with which he pierces his mortal Bride. The story of the thunder-smitten Semele reminds us that the Theotokos, in the last analysis Psyche, has ever been of Lunar, never herself of Solar stock; and all this is the sum and substance of every "solar myth," the theme of the *Liebesgeschichte des Himmels* and of the *Drachenkämpfe*.

¹ On the meaning of the "Synteresis," etymologically an equivalent of Skr. *samtâraka*, "one who helps to cross over," see O. Renz, "Die Synteresis nach dem Hl. Thomas von Aquin," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, X (Münster, 1911).

² Rom. 7:14-23; James 4:7.

³ St. Bonaventura, *Dominica prima post octavum epiphaniae*, 2.2. For the whole theme, see also Coomaraswamy, "On the Loathly Bride."

⁴ Pfeiffer ed., p. 288.

Who Is "Satan" and Where Is "Hell"? (II)

"Heaven and earth: let them be wed again."¹ Their marriage, consummated in the heart, is the *Hieros Gamos*, *Daivam Mithunam*,² and those in whom it has been perfected are no longer anyone, but as He is "who never became anyone."³ Plotinus' words: "Love is of the very nature of the Psyche, and hence the constant yoking of Eros with the Psyches in the pictures and the myths"⁴ might as well have been said of half the world's fairy-tales, and especially of the Indian "pictures and myths" of Sri Krishna and the Milkmaids, of which the Indian commentators rightly deny the historicity, asserting that all these are things that come to pass in all men's experience. Such, indeed, are "the *erôtica* (Skr. *srngâra*) into which, it seems that you, O Socrates, should be initiated," as Diotima says, and which in fact he so deeply respected.⁵

But, this is not only a matter of Grace; the soul's salvation depends also on her submission, her willing surrender; it is prevented for so long as she resists. It is her pride (*mâna*, *abhimâna*; *oiema*, *oiesis*; self-opinion, overweening), the Satanic conviction of her own independence (*asmi-mâna*, *ahamkâra*, *cogito ergo sum*), her evil rather than herself, that must be killed; this pride she calls her "self-respect," and would "rather die" than be divested of it. But the death that she at last, despite herself, desires, is no destruction but a transformation. Marriage is an initiatory death and integration (*nirvâna*, *samskâra*, *telos*).⁶ "Der Drache und die Jung-frau sind natürlich identisch";⁷ the "Fier Baiser" transforms the dragon; the mermaid loses her ophidian tail; the girl is no more when the woman has been "made"; from the nymph the winged soul emerges.⁸ And so "through Thee an Iblis may become again one of the Cherubim."⁹

And what follows when the lower and the higher forms of the soul have been united? This has nowhere been better described than in the *Aitareya Aranyaka* (II.3.7): "This Self gives itself to that self, and that self to this Self; they become one another; with the one form he (in whom this marriage has been consummated) is unified with yonder world, and with the other united to this world"; the *Brhadâraṇyaka Upanisad* (iv.3.23): "Embraced by the Prescient Self, he knows neither a within nor a without. Verily, that is his form in which his desire is obtained, in which the Self is his desire, and in which no more desires or grieves." "Amor ipse non quiescit, nisi in amato, quod fit, cum obtinet ipsum possessione plenaria";¹⁰ "Jam perfectam animam . . . gloriosam sibi sponsam Pater conglutinat."¹¹

¹ RV x.24.5.

² SB x.5.2.12.

³ KU 11.18.

⁴ *Enneads* vi.9.9.

⁵ Plato, *Symposium* 210A.

⁶ *Nirvâna*, J. 1.60; *samskâra*, Manu 11.67; *telos*, H. G. Liddell and R. Scou, *A Greeks-English Lexicon*, 8th ed., Oxford, 1897, s.v. vi.2.

⁷ E. Siecke, *Drachenkämpfe* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 14.

⁸ For the Fier Baiser see the references in Coomaraswamy, "On the Loathly Bride." For the marriage, Meister Eckhart (Pfeiffer ed., p. 407) and Omikron, *Letters from Paulos*, New York, 1920, *passim*.

⁹ Rûmî, *Mathnawî* iv.3496.

¹⁰ Jean de Castel, *De adhaerendo Deo*, C. 12.

¹¹ St. Bernard, *De grad. humilitatis*, vn.21.

Who Is "Satan" and Where Is "Hell"? (II)

Indeed:

*Dafern der Teufel könnst aus seiner Seinheit gehn,
So sahest du ihn stracks in Gottes Throne stehn.*¹

So, then, the Agathos and Kakos Daimons, Fair and Foul selves, Christ, and Antichrist, both inhabit us, and their opposition is within us. Heaven and Hell are the divided images of Love and Wrath *in divinis*, where the Light and the Darkness are undivided, and the Lamb and the Lion lie down together. In the beginning, as all traditions testify, heaven and earth were one and together; essence and nature are one in God, and it remains for every man to put them together again within himself.

All these are our answers. Satan is not a real and single Person, but a severally postulated personality, a "Legion." Each of these personalities is capable of redemption (*apokatastasis*), and can, if it will, become again what it was before it "fell" – Lucifer, Phosphorus, Helel, Scintilla, the Morning Star, a Ray of the Supernal Sun; because the Spark, however it may seem to be smothered, is an Asbestos that cannot be extinguished, even in hell. But, in the sense that a redemption of all beings cannot be thought of as taking place at any one time, and inasmuch as there will be devilish souls in need of redemption throughout all time, Satan must be thought of as being damned for ever, meaning by "damned," self-excluded from the vision of God and the knowledge of Truth.

The problem with which we started has been largely solved, but it still remains to accomplish the harder tasks of an actual "self-naughting" and consequent "Self-realization" to which the answers point, and for which theology is only a partial preparation. Satan and the Ego are not really entities, but concepts postulated and valid only for present, provisional, and practical purposes; both are composite photographs, as it were of X_1 X_2 , X_3 . It has often been said that the Devil's most ingenious device is to persuade us that his existence is a mere "superstition." In fact, however, nothing can be more dangerous than to deny his existence, which is as real, although no more so, as our own; we dare not deny Satan until we have denied ourselves, as everyone must who would follow Him who said and did nothing "of himself." "What is Love? the sea of non-existence";² and "whoever enters there, saying 'It is I, I [God], smite him in the face';³ "What is Love? thou shalt know when *thou* becomest *Me*."⁴

¹ Angelus Silesius, 1.143. Cf. *Theologia Germanica*, ch. xvi: "If the evil Spirit himself could come into true obedience, he would become an angel [of light] again, and all his sin and wickedness would be blotted out."

² *Mathnawî* 111.4723.

³ Rumi, *Divan*, Ode xxvin. "None has knowledge of each who enters that he is So-and-so or So-and-so," *ibid.*, p. 61.

⁴ *Mathnawî* II, Introduction.